

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVII

September 1919

NUMBER 5

FRANCIS BARTON GUMMERE, 1855-1919

At midnight on Friday, May 30, in his home at Haverford, Pennsylvania, Francis Barton Gummere passed from this life. Although it was widely known that for more than ten years he had suffered from broken health and was obliged to guard himself very carefully from overworking, few except his immediate circle of friends realized the seriousness of his condition. In 1907 his health broke down from nervous overstrain, and the loss of the use of his right eye brought to an end his research work in libraries and the close reading of manuscripts. Another illness, due to heart strain while on a mountain tramp in Virginia in the following year, resulted in permanent injury to his heart and made necessary, not entire abstention from productive work—his restless, creative spirit would not permit that—but a careful guarding of his time and strength, of which he often wrote somewhat bitterly. During these ten years were published two of his most important volumes, *The Oldest English Epic* (1909) and *Democracy and Poetry* (1911), and he was at work upon a critical history of Old English literature when the end came. This continued productivity kept distant scholars from appreciating the seriousness of his condition. But even his intimate friends were deceived by his cheerfulness, his lively conversation, his sparkling letters, and his unfailing intellectual vigor, and were little prepared for the shock of his sudden death. The immediate cause of his death was oedema of the lungs, due to heart

failure. It is good to know that he did not suffer long. The final seizure came suddenly on Friday evening with a feeling of great oppression, and after a little more than two hours of struggle he passed away. A memorial service was held at the College on Sunday, June 1; the funeral service, which was attended by colleagues and friends from near and far, occurred at his home on Monday, June 2; and he was laid to rest with his parents in the family burying-ground at Haverford.

In 1882 he married Amelia Smith Mott—daughter of Richard Field Mott, of Burlington, New Jersey—who for thirty-seven years shared his joys and cares and now laments his loss. She herself is well known for her interest in Colonial history, a subject on which she has published several valuable books. Of this union three sons remain: Richard Mott Gummere, Ph.D., formerly associate professor of Latin and assistant to the president in Haverford College, and now headmaster of the William Penn Charter School, at Philadelphia; Samuel James Gummere, Major, U.S.A., on the staff of General Pershing; and Francis Barton Gummere, Jr., who, though an invalid, inherits the love and talent for music which formed the basis of his father's mastery of the theory of verse.

Professor Gummere was the sixth in descent from a typical old American stock, and the history of the family is significant of the ideals and accomplishments of this stock.

His first ancestor in America was Johann Gómere, who with his wife, Anna, fled from French Flanders to escape religious persecution and in 1719 joined the Protestant refugees from Crefeldt who in that year came to America and settled in Germantown, Pennsylvania. Johann and Anna lived along the Wissahickon on a farm, now the old "Monastery" property, where both died and were buried on the same day in May, 1738.

Their son, John Gumre, married Sarah Davis and was the father of Samuel Gummere (b. 1750), who in 1783 married Rachel James and became a Quaker minister.

The eldest son of Samuel and Rachel was John Gummere (b. 1784), who in 1808 married Elizabeth Buzby. With this John began the connection of the family with Haverford College, for he was one of the founders of Haverford School, which later became

Haverford College, and was instructor in mathematics there and the second of its principals. John Gummere, like most of the eminent men of his time, was self-educated. He became one of the most learned mathematicians and astronomers in America, and was for thirty-one years a member of the American Philosophical Society and a contributor of valuable articles to its *Transactions*. His *Astronomy* passed through many editions and was for many years in use at West Point.

Samuel James Gummere (1811-74), son of John, inherited his father's genius and became a rare scholar, equally versed in mathematics and in languages. He taught in the Friends' School at Providence, Rhode Island, in the Haverford School, in a school founded by his father and himself at Burlington, New Jersey, and for the twelve years preceding his death was the first president of Haverford College.

Francis Barton Gummere was the son of Samuel James Gummere by his second wife, Elizabeth Barton, daughter of David Barton, of Philadelphia. He was born March 6, 1855, in Burlington, New Jersey, but at the age of seven, when his father became President of the College, removed to Haverford. He entered college very early, graduating A.B. in 1872, at the age of seventeen. After a year as clerk in an iron foundry and another spent in the law office of F. J. Gowan, in Philadelphia, he decided upon teaching as his profession and went to Harvard for further study. In 1875 he received both the A.B. from Harvard and the A.M. from Haverford and at once commenced to teach in the Friends' School, now the Moses Brown School, at Providence, Rhode Island, where his father had taught forty-five years earlier.

While at this school, he spent several months each year in study abroad, and from 1878 to 1881 attended lectures in Strassburg, Leipzig, Berlin, and Freiburg, taking his Ph.D. *magna cum laude* at Freiburg in 1881. In Germany his teachers were such men as Hermann Grimm, Curtius, Warnke, and Ten Brink, but the direction of his future studies had already been determined in America by his year at Harvard under the inspiration of Francis James Child.

After a year (1881-82) as instructor in English at Harvard, and five years (1882-87) as headmaster of the Swain Free School, at

New Bedford, Mass., founded under the will of William Swain for the higher education and training of teachers along university-extension lines, he accepted the professorship of English at Haverford College in 1887, a position which he held, despite all temptation to removal, to the end of his life.

Before entering upon his duties at Haverford, he spent another year in foreign study and travel, chiefly in Christiania and Stockholm, where he devoted himself to the Scandinavian languages and literatures. His facility in acquiring foreign languages was phenomenal, and his knowledge both of classical and of modern literature was broad and accurate. The literatures of Italy, France, Germany, and Scandinavia were almost as familiar to him as that of England and America, and he is reported to have been in the habit of reading Horace through at least once a year. Over the literature of his native tongue he ranged freely and was no less at home in the writings of George Meredith than in *Beowulf* and *Widsith*, or those mysterious ballads which formed so lasting an object of his study and speculation. He seemed, even to the most widely read of his friends, to have read every book worth reading in every age besides the thousands that have long been dead to all but antiquaries. His intimate familiarity with the best that has been written in English prose and verse appeared in his instant ability to recognize and continue passages quoted at random by others and still more in the style of his speech and his writing, where it took the form, not of quotation, but of a certain nervous elegance and subtle suggestiveness.

This is not the time or the place to review his publications. They are known to scholars wherever English scholarship is known. The appearance of each one, after the first, was awaited with an expectation of some vital contribution to the subject discussed, and this expectation was never defeated. His books were models of erudition, but of erudition sublimated in the alembic of a great personality. The field of folk-poetry he made in a special sense his own. His two earliest books—his doctoral dissertation on *The Anglo-Saxon Metaphor* (1881) and his *Handbook of Poetics* (1885)—were a sort of prentice work for his life-task, and his illuminating edition of Peele's "Old Wives Tale" (in Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, 1903) was a chip from the master's workshop.

Even those scholars who do not accept his theory of communal composition will admit that the complete analysis of the characteristics of popular literature which he first set forth in his articles in the first volume of *Modern Philology* (1903) and elaborated in *Democracy and Poetry* (1911) is a permanent and valuable contribution to the panoply of criticism, no less applicable to "the best sellers" of the twentieth century than to the ballads of the Middle Ages.

Since he died—as often before—I have asked myself what was the secret of his power. He had learning, he had vigor, he had charm, he had—in a measure given to few of his generation—that indefinable possession we call culture; but these qualities, separately or all together, hardly account for the total effect of the man and his work. He had the mind of a scientist and the temperament of an artist; or perhaps I had better say he had the mind and the temperament of the great artist, the creative imagination which sees its vision as a whole but does not rest content till it sees each detail as a perfect part of the perfect whole. He began his work at a period when the large conceptions of the romanticists in philology were just coming under the reshaping influence of the theories of Darwin and his followers—a time as rich in ideas and in enthusiasms as the period of the Renaissance. Men who in another age would have created statues or epic poems were smitten with a vision of the possibility of opening and reading the furled scroll of prehistoric life, of recreating the pageant of civilization from its remotest beginnings, of painting their half of the picture of the origin and destiny of man. It was this creative vision, this vitalizing imagination, which gave its charm, its power, its unity to all that Professor Gummere spoke or wrote. Literature was not for him a heap of dead leaves shaken from the tree but a living part of the body of life. He knew this and he made others share his knowledge.

Many times has it been asked why a man of his peculiar powers, his fertility of ideas, his breadth of culture, his capacity for leadership, chose to remain in a small college instead of stimulating and directing research in one of the large universities. It was generally known that he declined the headship of the Department of English at the University of Chicago in 1895 and an equally important chair

at Harvard in 1901. Doubtless many factors influenced his decision, chief among them loyalty to his college. But in reply to a direct question put to him in 1901, he told me that he believed the ideal life of the productive scholar was more nearly attainable in a small college with a well-equipped library than in a great university, that he had at Haverford all the books he needed, that his college work was thoroughly familiar to him, and that he had greater leisure for research than he could ever hope for elsewhere. The prospect of having him as a source of inspiration and a guide to a large body of younger scholars had stirred me greatly, but I could not deny the soundness of his view or urge him to accept a position which I knew only too well would consume large amounts of his time and energy in administrative machinery. Never for a moment, I think, did he regret the decision he made. And though his influence, direct and indirect, would undoubtedly have been wider in the larger field, his broad culture, his vivid sense of reality, his interest in contemporary life, his sense of humor, his vigor of intellect and character, awakened in both his colleagues and his students at Haverford a loyal and affectionate admiration which can hardly be estimated. This has been shown at many times in many ways, and it may be especially noted that already steps have been taken for the immediate creation by his former students of a fund for the purchase of books on subjects in poetry, the ballad, and related fields.

His work will live both in books and in men. This attempt at an appreciation of it—inadequate though it be—is his due, not merely because he was a valued counsellor of *Modern Philology* from its very conception down to the present year, but because he was one of the creators of that kind of scholarship which is more than erudition and a source of that kind of culture without which the achievements of science are delusive and vain.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY

THE DATE OF *THE OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE*

In 1176 and 1177 the papal legate Cardinal Vivian bore a commission from Pope Alexander the Third to visit "Ireland, Scotland, Norway, and the other circumjacent islands."¹ He actually did visit Galloway, the Isle of Man, Ireland, and Scotland. But as he did not go to continental Norway it is likely that by the terms of his commission, "Norway and the other circumjacent islands," he was authorized to visit not what is now Norway but those Scandinavianized portions of the British Isles—among them the Isle of Man—which had long been and until 1266 were destined to remain bound by loose political allegiance to the crown of Norway.

Galloway was at this date an almost independent state. William the Lion, King of Scotland, had been since 1174 the vassal of Henry the Second, and Henry had refused to receive Gilbert MacFergus Lord of Galloway as a direct vassal, bidding him rather accept William as his legitimate feudal superior. Gilbert, however, maintained a fierce if desultory warfare against Scotland till the end of his days. Furthermore, Galloway was a Goidelic-speaking territory colonized by the Irish, and it is altogether probable that there was a liberal admixture of Scandinavian blood in the province from the neighboring Hebrides and the coast of Argyle. A stranger might easily, therefore, be in doubt whether Galloway was a part of Ireland, of Scotland, or of British Norway.

Vivian certainly seems to have regarded Galloway as included in his commission. And the author of *The Owl and the Nightingale* clearly regards Galloway as a part of Norway, for in challenging the

¹ "Missus est itaque ad eos Vivianus presbyter cardinalis qui etiam legatiam Hiberniae Scotiae et Norwegiae et allarum circumjacentium insularum suscepit et circa festum S. Mariae Magdalenae applicuit in Anglia sine regis licentia." See Lawrie, *Annals of the Reigns of Malcolm and William, Kings of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1910), pp. 214-15. Except for this mission, information concerning Vivian is scanty, but I note the following in *Vitae et Gesta Summorum Pontificum Alfonsi Ciaconii*, ed. 1601, p. 476: "Vibianus Thomasius presb. Card. tt. s. Stefani in Coello monte. Alex. III. Bullae Montis Regalis an. 1176. Lucij. III. trium Fontium an. 1183." See also Gilles, *The Life and Letters of Thomas à Becket*, Letters XCH-XCV.

Nightingale to sing in foreign parts the Owl scornfully asks (vss. 905-10, 913-16):

Hwi nultu singe an oþer þeode,
 Par hit is muchele more neode?
 Ðu neauer ne singest in Irlonde
 ne þu ne cūest noȝt in Scotlonde.
Hwi nultu fare to Nore-weie?
an singen men of Gala-weie?

Hwi nultu þare preoste singe,
 an teche of þire writelinge,
 an wise heom mid þire steuene
 hu engeles singeð in þe heuene.¹

It is likely then that Vivian visited Galloway under the impression that it was a part of Norway. His arrival there is not mentioned but only his taking ship from Whithern for the Isle of Man, an undoubted part of British Norway, where he was hospitably received. It is also likely that Gilbert MacFergus, who aspired to be a direct vassal of King Henry and to assure his own independence of the hated Scots, had given the Cardinal a hostile reception. But some months later Vivian tried to treat Galloway as a part of Scotland; for he summoned the Bishop of Whithern to a council of the Scottish clergy convened at Holyrood, Edinburgh, on August 1, 1177. The bishop, however, refused to attend, representing that he was a suffragan of the Archbishop of York and therefore not bound to attend a council of the Scottish clergy. And for this disobedience Vivian suspended the bishop from his functions.

In the following year, 1178, Pope Alexander took pains to make himself perfectly clear about Galloway. For he sent out Peter of Saint Agatha with a commission which expressly mentioned Galloway, Scotland, Ireland, and the Isle of Man, but omitted the word "Norway," which seems to have occasioned so much trouble.²

¹ In quoting the text of *The Owl and the Nightingale* I have endeavored to construct from the two manuscripts as printed by Wells a text a trifle nearer to the original than either manuscript.

² "Venit et quidam alius in Anglia [sic] nuncius summi pontificis, qui Petrus de Sancta Agatha vocabatur, cui commissa erat cura summonendi viros ecclesiasticos Scotiae, Galuaeiae et insulae de Man, necnon et Hiberniae, tam archiepiscopos quam episcopos et abbates et priores, ut in vi obedientiae conventrent Romae in capite Jejuni ad praedictum concilium" (Benedictus Abbas, I, 210). See Lawrie, *Annals of the Reigns of Malcolm and William*, pp. 222-23.

I have already quoted passages which show that the author of *The Owl and the Nightingale* regarded Galloway as part of Norway, and also that he was especially interested in the clergy of Ireland, Scotland, "Norway," and Galloway. That Nicholas of Guildford, to whom the poem pays a compliment, was concerned with Scotland appears from the Nightingale's praise of him (vss. 1757-58):

An þurh his muþe & þurh his honde
hit is þe betere in to Scot londe.

In responding to the Owl's taunts the Nightingale represents that her singing would be lost on the inhabitants of Ireland, Scotland, and Galloway. Her description of the Acarnanians of King Henry's empire is of historic importance as expressing the sentiments of an English contemporary toward the backward portions of the British Isles. The Nightingale describes these people as irreclaimable wild beasts. But I am particularly concerned with what is almost certainly an allusion to the mission of Cardinal Vivian (vss. 1015-20):

Beȝ eni god man to hom come,
so wile dude sum from Rome,
for hom to lere gode þewes,
an for to leten hore un-þewes,
he miȝte bet sitte stille,
vor al his wile he sholde spille.¹

The attitude of the Nightingale toward the Irish requires little comment. They were a very backward people, and in the eyes of the Roman church they had long been heretics as well. The contemptuous remark of the Owl (vs. 322),

Du chaterest so doȝ an Irish prest,

evinces the author's preoccupation with the provincial clergy. But in explanation of the animosity of the Nightingale toward the Scots and Galwegians it should be said that apart from the feeling engendered by the contumacy of the Bishop of Whithern, already

¹ So far as I am aware, Professor J. W. H. Atkins, in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, I, 265, is the only person who has hitherto suggested that this is an allusion to Vivian's mission. But Professor Atkins expresses a doubt whether the allusion is not rather to Cardinal Guala's mission in 1218, which had no reference at all to Ireland, and is not recorded to have occasioned special mention of Galloway or Norway. Furthermore Professor Atkins makes no chronological inferences.

mentioned, England had been frightfully ravaged in 1138, 1173, and 1174 by armies of the Scottish kings David and William, armies in which there are recorded to have been a multitude of the men of Galloway, who especially distinguished themselves by their atrocities. Furthermore, immediately after the invasion of 1174 Gilbert of Galloway, returning to his dominions, murdered his own brother Uhtred and slew or expelled all officers of the King of Scotland, of whom he aspired to be independent.

All told it is highly probable that *The Owl and the Nightingale* was written between Christmas, 1176, when Vivian left Galloway, and September 21, 1178, when Peter of Saint Agatha's commission, mentioning the Isle of Man and Galloway but avoiding the mention of British Norway, had relegated to the past Vivian's contention that Galloway was part of Norway. It is nearly as probable that Nicholas was a member of the escort which King Henry is reported to have given Vivian on his journey to Galloway, the Isle of Man, Ireland, and Scotland.

Evidence is not lacking that even if the *terminus ad quem* 1178 be too early, it cannot be so by more than a dozen years. For the lines (1757-58),

An þurh his muþe & þurh his honde
hit is þe betere in to Scot londe,

not only show that Nicholas of Guildford had had something to do with Scotland; they also express the complacency with which Englishmen regarded the position of Scotland from 1174 to 1189 when William the Lion was the direct liegeman of Henry the Second, not merely for English fiefs like Huntingdon, Northampton, or Northumberland, but for Scotland itself. It is clear from numerous passages in the chronicles that the news of the capture of William at Alnwick in 1174 sent a peculiar thrill of joy and exultation through all England. Church-bells were tolled everywhere, and the miraculous intervention of God and Saint Thomas was evident to all believers. From the position of feudal subordination which William shortly afterward accepted he was released by Richard the First in 1189 in return for 10,000 marks of silver. It is most improbable that the Nightingale's proud reference to Scotland was written later than 1189.

Furthermore, in 1185 Gilbert MacFergus of Galloway died. After a few months of dissension he was succeeded by his nephew Roland McUhtred, an enlightened prince who did much to temper the condition of Galloway. It is unlikely that the Nightingale's bitter reference to a barbarous and irreclaimable Galloway was written after the influence of Roland began to be felt.

Nor is this all. For in describing the wild Irish and others the Nightingale says (vss. 1013-14):

he goþ bi tizt mid ruþe velle
riþt suich he comen ut of helle.

That the author introduces here no allusion to Saint Patrick's Purgatory is perhaps due to the fact that he was writing before the first recorded mention of that Purgatory by Jocelin of Furness about 1183, or at least before the popularization of the myth by the monk of Saltrey, who appears to have written before the canonization of Saint Malachi in 1189.¹

I will also observe that the references to excommunication in *The Owl and the Nightingale* are likely to have been prompted by recollection of the suspension of the Bishop of Whithern, or of the excommunications which Becket launched against his enemies from Vézelay in 1166.

My argument thus far is based upon what appear to be historical allusions in the poem. These are best explained by assuming that the poem was written in 1177 or 1178. A few objections to this date may now be considered.

1. First of all, the Nightingale's prayer for the soul of King Henry (vss. 1091-92):

Dat under-wat þe King Henri,
Jesus his soule do merci.

With scarcely a dissenting voice² it has been agreed that this is a prayer for the dead, and that therefore the poem was written

¹ See *L'Espurgatoire Saint Patrice*, ed. Jenkins, pp. 1 ff. Incidentally I may remark that from a remote period certain parts of the British Isles had been regarded as a world of departed spirits. See Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, I, 201-3; Procopius *De Bello Gothico* iv. 20. 48 sqq. Also and *per contra* the Nightingale's phrase was proverbial. See *Richard Coeur de Lion*, ed. Brunner, vss. 6703-4, where it is said of the Saracens:

"No tungge," he seide, "may hem telle;
I wene þey comen out of helle."

² See footnote on p. xvii of Wells's excellent edition of *The Owl and the Nightingale*; also Breier, *Eule und Nachtigall* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1910), p. 159.

after the death of Henry the Second in 1189. But the reading of the Cotton MS alone should have warned us against this conclusion since the verb *under-wat* has the meaning of a present tense and shows that the scribe understood that Henry was still living when the prayer was offered. Neither is it clear whether the poet meant Henry the Second or his son Henry, who shared the royal title from 1170 till his death on June 11, 1182. Indeed as an exponent of romantic chivalry the younger king might be held a more appropriate subject of the Nightingale's prayers than his practical and unromantic father. Nor do we lack evidence of prayers for the souls of the living during the Middle Ages. Numerous authors conclude their compositions with a prayer either for their own souls or for those of their readers, or by requesting the reader to pray for the author's soul. *Havelok*, *Sawles Ward*, *An Orison of Our Lord*, and the *Poema Morale* are concluded in this manner. Prayers for the soul of the reigning king must have been offered. In the English charters of Henry the First and Henry the Second these monarchs commend the redemption of their souls to Christ.¹ And it was customary for subjects to swear "on the soul of the King" that he would be faithful to a treaty in question.² In fact, the idea that Henry the Second or his son Henry was dead when the Nightingale prayed for his soul is utterly without foundation.³

2. It has been suggested that the *Galaweie* mentioned by the Owl is not Galloway in Scotland but Galway in Ireland. This is exceedingly improbable; for while Galloway figures conspicuously in the history of England during the twelfth century, Galway was so little known to Englishmen of that era that an unexplained reference to the Irish county might easily have proved unintelligible.

3. It may be urged that the word *wile*, "once," "once upon a time," in the line (1016),

so wile dude sum from Rome,

¹ See Hickes, *Thesaurus*, *Praefatio*, p. xvi. Stubbs in his *Constitutional History* (I, 442, note) refers to this page for an English charter of Stephen which is not there. The charter of Henry the Second is also printed in *Anglia*, VII, 220-21, as edited by Strathmann.

² See Robertson, *Scotland under Her Early Kings*, II, 42, 65, 82-83, 113.

³ Because Giraldus Cambrensis in 1210 offered a prayer for the soul of Walter Map, it has been inferred that Map was dead in 1210. Such a conclusion is more favored by the imperfect tense *solebat* than by the actual prayer "*cujus animae propitiatur Deus*." See Giraldus (Rolls Series), V, 410.

implies that the mission of Vivian had taken place long ago. But the expression (which is very indefinite) may be due to the poet's having had vaguely in mind earlier embassies as well as Vivian's. The invasion of Ireland by King Henry was authorized by a bull of Pope Adrian the Fourth, and may have been regarded as constructively a papal embassy. Or the poet may have remembered the embassy of Cardinal Paparone to Ireland and the Synod of Kells in 1152. Furthermore, even if the poet was thinking only of the legateship of Vivian, the lapse of six months or so may have been regarded as relegating Vivian to a distant past according to the standard of owls and nightingales. This last suggestion is perfectly in accord with the poet's sly humor and powers of characterization.

4. An attempt has been made by Gadow and Felix Liebermann to identify the poet's Nicholas of Guildford with a certain *Nicholaus capellanus archidiaconi*, and with *Nicholaus submonitor capituli de Gudeford*, respectively mentioned in documents of Salisbury, the former in 1209 and the latter in 1220.¹ The identification is by no means unplausible, even though neither Nicholas is connected with Portesham in Dorset, where *The Owl and the Nightingale* places Nicholas of Guildford.² But even if accepted, the identification only proves that Nicholas must have been sixty years old or upward in 1220 if *The Owl and the Nightingale* was written in 1177. This is no valid ground for abandoning 1177 as the date of composition. The Nightingale's complaint that the services of Nicholas were unrewarded is perhaps more intelligible if Nicholas was a young and ambitious but unimportant member of the escort, though the fact that Vivian left the Scottish church independent of either York or Canterbury at a time when Henry the Second desired to subject Scotland to one of these sees would abundantly account for the failure of the English bishops to recognize any services of Nicholas to Vivian.

The presumption is, then, that *The Owl and the Nightingale* was written in 1177 or 1178. This contention is founded on the historical allusions which the poem appears to contain. The linguistic evidence is far more difficult to discuss. To determine

¹ See Wilhelm Gadow, *Das Mittlenglische Streitgedicht, Eule und Nachtigall* (Berlin, 1910), pp. 12-13.

² Vss. 1752-54.

the date of a Middle English poem by the dialect is sometimes like trying to tell the hour of day in a room where there are twenty clocks, no two of which keep the same time; for dialect depends not only on date but also on locality and on personality. Furthermore, the monuments of this period are seldom autographs, and we are ever at the mercy of a blundering or modernizing scribe. Linguistic evidence being therefore less precise than that derived from historical allusions, I shall content myself with enumerating a few carefully considered points which indicate, I submit, an earlier date for the poem than has hitherto been propounded. They are the following:

1. Eight cases of the dual number of the personal pronoun. The first person occurs in 151, 552, 993, 1689, 1780, 1782, and 1783; the second person *hunke* occurs in 1732.¹

2. The neuter plural *grinew*, 1056, retaining the Anglo-Saxon *-u*.

3. The comparative in *-re*: *mildre*, 1775.

4. The inflected numerals: *anne*, 811, 831; *twere*, *twire*, *tweyre*, 888, 991, 1396; *beire*, *beyre*, 1584; *twam*, *twom*, 991, 1477.

5. The inflected indefinite article: *ore*, 17, 1754.

6. The inflected definite adjectives: *fulne*, 1196; *godne*, 812; *rihtne*, 1238.

7. The inflected possessives: *mire*, *myre*, 1741; *þire*, 429, 914, 915, 1650, etc.

8. The conjunction *þe*:

(a) meaning "or": 824, 1064, 1362, 1408.

(b) meaning "than": 564.

(c) meaning "that": 941.

¹ The value of the Middle English dual as a criterion of date has not yet been properly recognized. *Havelok* is the only monument containing duals (*wit* [MS *will*], 1336, and *unke*, 1882) which may confidently be dated later than 1200, and even in *Havelok* the dual is likely to have been taken over from some earlier version of the story. Layamon is of the twelfth century (see p. 256, n. 1) and Orm probably of the first half of that century. There are no duals in *Ancren Riwe*. *Genesis and Exodus* is in a peculiar dialect, resembling that of the *Bestiary* and *The Proverbs of Alfred* (Text II in Morris' *Miscellany*). It is of a Midland type and therefore likely to have simplified its diphthongs and lost its inflections early. Nevertheless it presents the following duals: *wit*, 1775, 2934; *unc*, 1776; *gunkere*, 398; *gunc*, 2830; *twit* (MS *we it*), 1777; *twet*, 3093. Furthermore, although much more than twice as long as *The Owl and the Nightingale*, *Genesis* and *Exodus* contains but ninety-eight words of French origin. (From the list given by Fritzsche in *Anglia*, V, 83-84, omit *orgel*, which is probably from the Anglo-Saxon. The French form is written with an *i*, e.g., *orgel*.) I conclude that *Genesis* and *Exodus* is probably older than 1250, and possibly earlier than 1200.

9. The hortative particle *ute, vte* (A.S. *utan, uton*), followed by the infinitive: 1779.¹

10. The formula *Alured King*, 235, for "King Alfred."²

11. The forms *eauar*, "ever," 1474; *obar*, "other," 479; *and-sware*, "answer," 639, 657; *al-swa*, "also," 1663; *alswa*, "just so," 1329, 1373.

The considerations above are of course of unequal weight, but their collective force is, I submit, sufficient to show that *The Owl and the Nightingale* was written earlier than *Ancren Riwle*, the date of which can hardly be later than 1230, and by Einenkel was placed "about 1200."³

Furthermore, the entries of the Peterborough Chronicle from 1135 to 1154 can hardly have been written as late as 1160. It is true they were written in Northamptonshire, where the language was less conservative than in the south of England; but they were also probably written by a monk who was familiar with the earlier entries of the Chronicles and more or less influenced by the earlier language of 1121.⁴ It is therefore curious to find that the entries from 1135 to 1154 show a larger percentage of French words than does *The Owl and the Nightingale*. For the entries from 1135 to 1154 occupy 221 lines in Plummer's edition of the text and contain from twenty to twenty-two French words. *The Owl and the Nightingale* has 1784 lines, the line averaging more than two-fifths as long as a line in Plummer's duodecimo volume. *The Owl and the Nightingale* should therefore contain upward of sixty-four French words in order to equal the entries in this respect. As a matter of fact *The Owl and the Nightingale* contains less than fifty-five French words.⁵ Various English homilies of the twelfth century are also better supplied with

¹ This occurs also in various places in Morris' *Miscellany: The Passion of Our Lord*, 1779; *Sinners Beware!* 67, 225, 229.

² In the Peterborough Chronicle we have *Henri king*, anno. 1132, 1137; *Stephnes kinges*, anno. 1137; *Rodbert eorl*, anno. 1140; *Martin abbot*, anno. 1137. In *The Shires and Hundreds of England* (a document datable between the appointment of Jean de Villula as first Bishop of Bath by William the Second, and the cession of Northumberland to Henry the Second by Malcolm the Fourth of Scotland in 1157, Morris' *Miscellany*, pp. 145-46) we have *eadward king*; *myd eadwardes kynges leave*; *Heremon biscop*.

³ See the *Life of Saint Katherine* (E.E.T.S., 1884), p. xviii.

⁴ See Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles*, II, xxxv.

⁵ See Breier, *Eule und Nachtigall* (Halle, 1910), pp. 151-55. His list includes some doubtful cases.

French words than *The Owl and the Nightingale*. These considerations certainly tend to show that 1177 is by no means too early a date for the English poem.

It is true that Layamon's *Brut*, which was pretty certainly written between 1173 and 1189,¹ is in a dialect far more archaic than *The Owl and the Nightingale*. But this is due to other considerations than chronology. For the *Brut* was written in another locality, and above all by a poet who deliberately archaized his manner. Layamon is not a witty satirist like the author of *The Owl and the Nightingale*. On the contrary he is a poet whose genius made for what is venerable and majestic. His finest passages are of impressive solemnity. His theme was of the remote past. One of his acknowledged sources was the Anglo-Saxon translation of Bede. As he borrowed scarcely anything from its content, it is likely that he was considerably influenced by its language—especially by its inflections and spelling—else he would hardly have mentioned it as one of his sources. Furthermore, the meter of Layamon closely resembles that of certain poems in the Old English Chronicle, especially the poem on William

¹ The evidence as to the date of Layamon's *Brut* has in some points been strangely misinterpreted. Madden was probably right in regarding vss. 2916-21 as an allusion to the destruction of the city of Leicester in the year 1173 (see Madden's *Layamon*, I, xviii), and this remains our best *terminus a quo*. But with the only two remaining historical allusions in the poem I would respectfully suggest that this very able scholar was less fortunate. In his prolog Layamon speaks of having used as one of his sources a book by a French clerk called Wace, and adds (vss. 42-44):

& he hoe ȝef þare æðelen
Ælленor þe wes Henries quene þes heȝes kinges,

"And he [Wace] gave it [the book] to the noble Eleanor who was queen of Henry the high king." Madden supposed that the verb *wes* meant "was then but is no longer," and accordingly inferred that Layamon must have written after the death of Henry the Second in 1189 or even after the death of Eleanor herself in 1204. But if *wes* means anything more than simply "was," it is, I submit, far more natural to suppose that Layamon meant that in 1155, when Wace presented his book to Eleanor, she "was already" or "had become" (the early English preterite has frequently the force of a pluperfect) the Queen of England in 1154, after having successively acquired the titles of Duchess of Aquitaine, Queen of France (which she lost), and Countess of Anjou. The solemn mention of her position and the absence of any mention of the death of Henry the Second is of itself presumptive evidence that Henry was still living when Layamon wrote.

The history of the tribute called "Peter's Pence" outlined in the *Brut* (vss. 31945-80) offers no obstacle to dating the poem as early as 1173, since Henry the Second ordered the payment of "Peter's Pence" to be discontinued in 1164 and again in 1169. Layamon's comment (vss. 31979-80),

drihtē wat hu longe þeo laȝen scullen ilæste,

"the Lord knoweth how long the custom shall last," clearly implies that the payment continued in spite of the edicts which brought it to Layamon's attention. See Madden's *Layamon*, I, xviii-xx.

the Conqueror,¹ and he employs not a few of the epic formulas of Old English poetry. That his archaism is deliberate and artificial, and not the usage of his own day, is shown by the presence of false archaism, as in verses 13846-47:

what cnihtes we beoð & whanene we icumen seoð

Unless *beoð*: *seoð* should be altered to *beon*: *seon* we probably have in *seoð* a form invented by Layamon himself, since *seoð* is correct neither for an indicative nor for an optative. If Ben Jonson had lived in the twelfth century he might have leveled at Layamon the taunt which he actually aimed at Spenser, that "because he affected the ancients he writ no language," a remark which obviously savors of the grammarian who wrote an *English Grammar* rather than of the poet who wrote *The Sad Shepherd*.²

No light has yet been thrown on the date of *The Owl and the Nightingale* by the study of analogs and sources. Analogs are numerous, but their dates and mutual relations are obscure. This conclusion, which I have reached after considerable investigation, is important, if correct, and I would emphasize it.³ From what appear to be historical allusions I have presented an argument of considerable

¹ As was pointed out by Kluge in Paul and Braune, *Beiträge*, IX, 422 ff.

² The subject of Layamon's archaisms has hitherto received little attention from scholars, but an interesting paper, which will doubtless soon be published, on "Epic Formulas in Layamon," was read before the Modern Language Association by Professor Tatlock in December, 1917.

³ I relegate to a note a few points not concerned with the main argument. The antithesis between owl and nightingale was apparently proverbial. Walter Map's *Epistle of Valerius to Rufinus* begins thus:

"Loqui prohibeor et tacere non possum. Grues odi et uocem ulule, bubonem et aues ceteras que lutose hiemis grauitatem luctuose preululant; et tu subsannas uenturi vaticinia pendit, vera, si persueras. Ideo loqui prohibeor, veritatis augur, non voluntatis.

"Lu<s>ciniam amo et merulam que leticiam aure lenis concentu placido preloquuntur, et potissimum philomenam, que optate tempus iocunditatis tota deliciarum plenitudine annulat, nec fallor."

See Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. James (Oxford, 1914), p. 143 (*Distincio* IV, *capitulum* III). With the foregoing compare especially *The Owl and the Nightingale*, vss. 411-16:

Hule, heo seide, hwi dostu so?
þu singest a winter wola-wo:
þu singest so doþ þen asnowe,
al þat heo singeþ hit is for wowe.
A winter þu singest wroþe & ȝomere,
an eure þu art dumb a sumere.

This parallel may some day throw light on the date of the *Epistle of Valerius*. For the present I am concerned only to ask, Is not *The Owl and the Nightingale* related to some proverb resembling the Low German *Wat dem eenen sîn Uhl ist dem andern sîn Nachtigall* ("One man's owl is another man's nightingale") very much as Mr. Joseph

strength for dating *The Owl and the Nightingale* in 1177 or 1178, or at least not later than 1189. To whatever objections this conclusion may be open, I believe it is not only more precise but also better supported by evidence than any other date that has hitherto been propounded for a document in English between the charter of Henry the Second of 1154-61 and the proclamation of Henry the Third of 1258. If accepted, my conclusion will involve as a corollary considerable revision of the hitherto received chronology of Early Middle English literature.

HENRY BARRETT HINCKLEY

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Jacobs has declared that animal fables are related to proverbs? See Jacobs, *The Fables of Aesop*, I, 204-5. I owe the Low German proverb to Dr. Richard Goldschmidt, a well-known biologist.

I surmise that Nicholas of Guildford was himself the author of *The Owl and the Nightingale*. It is difficult to see how so excellent a poet should have paid such a tribute to an obscure cleric unless the poet himself had been the cleric, conscious of great literary powers but lacking in the qualities that bring ecclesiastical promotion. Poets not infrequently paid themselves compliments during the Middle Ages, especially in Provence. And even in the nineteenth century Walt Whitman wrote laudatory reviews of his own books. That the author of *The Owl and the Nightingale* can hardly have been John of Guildford is one of a number of good points made by Koch in *Anglia Beiblatt*, XXI, 230-31. In writing this paper I have incurred special obligations to the excellent work on the subject by Wells, Gadow, and Breier.

THE EARLY POPULARITY OF MILTON'S MINOR POEMS

L'Allegro and Il Penseroso, which are now universally known; but which, by a strange fatality, lay in a sort of obscurity, the private enjoyment of a few curious readers, till they were set to admirable music by Mr. Handel. And, indeed, this volume of Milton's Miscellaneous Poems has not till very lately met with suitable regard.—Joseph Warton, *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* (1757), I, 38.

On this statement, echoed in 1785 by Thomas Warton in his edition of Milton's *Poems on several occasions*¹ and by Wordsworth in his "Essay supplementary to the Preface of 1802"—where the recognition of the poems is postponed to about 1785—literary history has been based. In spite of the able protests of William Godwin² against the statements of Thomas Warton, those statements have prevailed even in the work of recent students of Milton.³ It is important, however, to note that Todd, a friend of Warton's, expressed surprise "that Mr. Warton should have asserted that for seventy years after their first publication, he recollects no mention of these poems in the whole succession of English literature."⁴ Todd thereupon corrected some of the mistakes in Warton's facts and cited some bits of evidence to disprove neglect. Masson,⁵ though conservative in the matter, seems rather to agree with the views here to be stated. There is no doubt, of course, that throughout the eighteenth century "Paradise Lost" was much more popular than Milton's other poems; and there is no doubt that the middle of the eighteenth century saw a great outburst of imitation and praise of the "minor" poems. But an increased vogue does not necessarily imply previous neglect, and literary historians have commonly said that the minor poems were neglected for a hundred years after their first publication. A fairly extensive, if cursory,

¹ See pp. x-xii of the 2d ed. (1791), to which all my references here are made.

² Godwin's *Lives of Edward and John Philips* (1815), pp. 286 ff.

³ R. D. Havens in *Eng. Stud.*, XL, 175 ff., 187 ff.; J. W. Good, *Studies in the Milton Tradition* (1915), pp. 141-42; Dowden, *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1907-8), p. 291.

⁴ Todd's (2d ed. of Milton's *Poetical Works* (1809), I, 61-62.

⁵ See his *Life of Milton*, VI, 775 ff.

reading of English prose and poetry of the century following the Restoration has led me to the belief that phrasal echoes as well as critical comments and multiplicity of editions indicate for the poems a widespread and high regard from the time of their first publication. We shall then study the vogue of these poems before 1740, by which approximate date the poems are commonly thought to have attained due recognition.

I

It may be proper first to examine the usual form in which these poems were printed. The customary view, I believe, is that they were printed as a necessary part of Milton's "Poetical Works," and rarely except as such. At first sight this seems an entirely just view. In the period under consideration were printed eighteen separate editions of "Paradise Lost," and the poem appeared also eleven times in editions classed by Dr. Good as "Poetical Works."¹ The more important of the minor poems, aside from these eleven inevitable printings, were issued, variously grouped, on an average of five times each when clearly independent of the "Poetical Works." The following table, imitatively based on Dr. Good's results,² may be of assistance:

¹ *Studies in the Milton Tradition*, p. 25.

² See *op. cit.*, chapter II. "Comus" was in 1738 printed four times in the form Dalton gave it for stage performance. I have omitted these editions, anticipating an objection that they are not Milton. The table may be further explained by giving the dates of editions (except the 18 of "Paradise Lost"). Under A we have "Comus" in 1637 and 1638; "Lycidas" in 1638. Under B the dates are 1645, 1673; under C, 1695, 1698 (the 1731 ed., Dr. Good to the contrary, is in two volumes); under D, 1705, 1707, 1713, 1720, 1721, 1725, 1727, 1730, 1731; under E, 1695; under F, 1716 and 1727; under G, 1671, 1672, 1680, 1688.

The initials of the minor poems are used throughout this article to abbreviate the names.

How Printed	Paradise Lost	Paradise Regain'd	L'Allegro in Penseroso	Comus	Lycidas	Samson Agonistes
A. In separate editions	18	2	1
B. <i>Poems on several occasions</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2
C. In <i>Poetical Works</i> (1 vol.)
D. In "Poetical Works" (2 vols.) (So called by Dr. Good)	9	9	9	9	9	9
E. <i>Paradise Regain'd</i> and minor poems	1	1	1	1	1
F. In <i>Dryden's Miscellany</i>
G. <i>Paradise Regain'd</i> and <i>Samson</i> together	4	4
Total editions before 1740	29	16	16	16	17	16

It is noteworthy that the one-volume and two-volume editions of the *Poetical Works* have been separated here. In 1695 "Paradise Regain'd," "Samson Agonistes," and the minor poems appeared as a volume, and beginning with 1705, according to Dr. Good, this combination became the second volume of the "Poetical Works," as he calls them. It is clear that in some editions—such as that of 1695—the minor poems are regarded as subordinated to the three major works, for the minor poems are printed in two columns, while the others are not; but when they are (with "Paradise Regain'd" and "Samson," to be sure) given a volume by themselves, they cease in part to depend on the greater epic. Their independence seems more plausible when it is noted that this "second" volume is sometimes—I have not seen all the editions—printed without any indication of the fact that it is part of the "Poetical Works." A specimen title-page runs:

Paradise Regain'd./ A POEM./ In Four BOOKS./ To which is added/ SAMSON AGONISTES./ AND/ POEMS upon several Occasions./ With a Tractate of Education./ The AUTHOR/ JOHN MILTON./ The FIFTH EDITION. Adorn'd with Cuts./ London: Printed for J. Tonson, at Shake/ spear's Head, over-against Catherine-/ Street in the Strand. 1713./

The only indication of relationship of this volume to any other is a gilt "2" on the back; the words "Poetical Works" are nowhere to be found in it. The "sixth" and "seventh" editions of these poems (1725 and 1730) lack even this "2," as do some of the 1752 edition edited by Newton. Unfortunately, other editions that I have seen have been recently rebound, but the title-pages indicate no connection between the two volumes. At least, then, the idea that the shorter pieces were printed only as pendants to "Paradise Lost" should be expressed with great caution. Indeed, the fact that Tonson printed these poems eight times between 1705 and 1730 in a volume by themselves shows undoubted commercial demand; for it is practically certain that the volumes were not made to be sold only in sets. Tonson also included three of the poems—probably the most popular three—in Dryden's *Miscellany* for 1716 and 1727. The only conclusion safely to be drawn from printing during this period is that these poems in one combination

or another were so frequently before the public that it would be strange if they were not read. It is interesting to see that during the years 1712 to 1732 "The Rape of the Lock"—admittedly one of the most popular poems of its day—was reprinted, separately or in combination with other pieces, about a dozen times. In the same period "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," and "Lycidas" were, considering all combinations, printed about nine times. In this case reprintings do not prove much perhaps; but certainly the steady reprinting tends to disprove neglect.¹

II

Preliminary to any presentation of "critical" comment on these poems during our period, it is necessary to remind the reader that—Milton entirely aside—the critics of the time seem to have showed no great acumen; that criticism proceeded almost entirely to the discussion of "the greater poetry" (epic, tragedy, ode)—about which it has said little of permanent value. All lyric poetry was neglected by critics: in this sense Milton's minor poems were neglected. But they were no more neglected by critics than were the smaller pieces of Cowley, Waller, and Dryden. It is, furthermore, necessary to remark that whenever the poems are mentioned by critics (with perhaps two or three exceptions) they are mentioned with very high praise.² The shining exception is Dryden,³ who in 1693 alleged

¹ I have based my account of these editions upon Dr. Good's very explicit work (*op. cit.*, pp. 24–43). As a matter of additional record, I may cite Professor Arber's *Term Catalogues* (1903–6), II, 525, for a reprint of "Lycidas" (1694) with a Latin version by W. Hog, which Dr. Good does not count as an English edition—and which I have not counted here. On the other hand, the Boston Public Library copy of Tonson's 1695 edition of Milton seems merely to bind in unsold copies of the 1688 print of "Paradise Regain'd" and "Samson Agonistes." Dr. Good counts these two editions, and I have followed him. Similarly I have neglected the fact, unnoted by him, that the 1721 edition of "Paradise Regain'd," etc., uses the 1713 print of "Samson Agonistes." Quite evidently Tonson reprinted only such poems by Milton as the public wished to buy. I am frank to confess that I have seen only the editions of Milton that may be seen at Harvard, at the Boston Public Library, and in the various libraries of Chicago.

² This is true for everything except "Paradise Regain'd." Those who say, as does Dr. Good (*op. cit.*, p. 34) among others, that the minor poems were "almost uniformly subordinated to the lesser epic" should note the fact that while the minor poems are mentioned practically always with praise, "Paradise Regain'd" is spoken of in quite another tone. See, for example, Edward Phillips' *Life of Milton* (1694), p. ix; R. Meadowcourt's *Critique on Milton's Paradise Regain'd* (1732), p. 3; John Jortin's *Remarks on Spenser's Poems* (1734), p. 171; J. Richardson's *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost* (1734), p. xciv.

³ W. P. Ker, *Essays of John Dryden*, II, 30.

in his own breezy manner that the reason Milton used blank verse was "that rhyme was not his talent," and adduced as proof that the rhyme in Milton's early poems "is always constrained and forced, and comes hardly from him, at an age when the soul is most pliant, and the passion of love makes almost every man a rhymers, though not a poet." This opinion certainly indicates ignorance of the poems or unscrupulous argumentative practice—or probably both. William Benson, in his *Letters concerning Poetical Translations, and Virgil's and Milton's Arts of Verse, &c.* (1739), p. 61, quotes Dryden's remark approvingly; but Benson's rank as critic may be gauged by the fact that a main thesis of his *Letters* is that "the principal Advantage *Virgil* has over *Milton* is *Virgil's Rhyme*" (p. 8). These views, in any case, are highly exceptional. If we examine the notices of the poems to be found in biographies, essays, letters, and eulogistic poems, we shall see a considerable number of passages expressing high commendation. Because any attempt at "organization" of this material would be artificial, and because there is obvious advantage in seeing the historical cumulation of references to the poems, these exceedingly miscellaneous bits of evidence will be chronologically listed.

1637. Sir Henry Wootton's letter commendatory of "Comus" certainly started Milton criticism with superlative praise. Even if, with Thomas Warton, we discount the tribute as due in part to friendship, we still see the evident delight of the writer glow forth. The letter is usually reprinted with "Comus."

1637. Lawes, H. In the dedication prefixed to the first edition of "Comus" Lawes informs Viscount Brackley "that the often copying of it hath tired my pen to give my several friends satisfaction, and brought me to a necessity of producing it to the public view."¹

1645. Moseley, Humphrey. Moseley, the printer of the poems, prefixed to the 1645 edition some remarks addressed "To the Reader" which seem significant. In part they read:

The Author's more peculiar excellency in these studies was too well known to conceal his Papers, or to keep me from attempting to solicit them from him. Let the event guide itself which way it will, I shall deserve

¹ Quoted from the Clarendon Press ed. (1906), I, 46.

of the age by bringing into the light as true a birth as the Muses have brought forth since our famous SPENSER wrote; whose Poems in these English ones are as rarely imitated as sweetly excelled.¹

After a great deal of this has been credited to the eternal advertising tendency, it remains true that since Moseley was publisher for many poets, he could not afford to waste fond superlatives on poems that were not ~~assured~~ a success even before publication. To these early tributes by Wootton, Lawes, and Moseley might be added the flattering compliments paid the young poet by his Italian friends, but since we are primarily concerned with his English reputation, those are here omitted.²

Ca. 1648. Archbishop Sancroft thought highly enough of the "Nativity Ode" and the version of the "Fifty-third Psalm" to copy them from "John Milton's poems." Thomas Warton regarded this act as "perhaps almost the only instance on record, in that period of time [1645-1715], of their having received any, even a slight, mark of attention or notice."³ The statement is a fair sample of the lack of investigation upon which the Wartons based their theory of neglect.

1655. Cotgrave, John. *The English Treasury of Wit and Language*. Thomas Warton (*op. cit.*, p. vii) regards omission of the minor poems from this work as evidence of neglect, but Godwin calls attention to the fact that Cotgrave drew only from dramatic poets.⁴ Omission of "Comus" in such a case becomes regrettable but comprehensible.

1657. Poole, Joshua. *The English Parnassus: or a helpe to English Poesie*. In citing this as one of the books in which not "the quantity of a hemistich" of Milton is quoted, Warton made one of the worst blunders of his career. Godwin is quite right in saying that the "Poems on Several Occasions, published twelve years before, appear to be cited as often as the writings of almost any other author"—which means as often as the greatest Elizabethans are cited. Godwin quotes Todd as saying "there are few

¹ See Todd's ed. (1809), I, 61; the Everyman Library ed., p. 375; or almost any good edition for this letter.

² For this Italian reputation see Masson's *Life*, I, chap. viii, *passim*.

³ See Thomas Warton's ed. of *Milton's Poems upon several occasions*, 1791 (his 2d ed.), p. v.

⁴ *Lives of Edward and John Philips* (1815), p. 286.

pages in which quotations may not be found from Milton's poetry."

1660. Saumaise, Claude. *Claudii Salmasii ad Johannem Miltonum Responsio*. On page 5 of this work Saumaise jeers at Milton's false quantities in his Latin poems, and adds sarcastically:

Tametsi aetatem illis, qua scripta sunt, non apposuisset, facile tamen perspicere poteramus pueri esse poemata. Sed puerilia errata praestare debet jam vir, cum & paucos abhinc annos recudi Londini curaverit. Si stylus hic ejus semper fuisset, & amoribus cantandis aut naeniis mortualibus plorandis tempus tantum impendisset, pessimum poetarum longe anteferebam optimo patronorum, qui pessimam causam tueretur.

This is not evidence of high regard, but I think it does argue the poems known in 1660. It begot later criticism. (See 1695, Morhof.)

1669. Phillips, Edward. *Joannis Buchleri Sacrarum Profanarumque Phrasium Poeticarum Thesaurus* (17th edition). Appended to this work was a section entitled *Tractatulus de Carmine Dramatico Poetarum Veterum, cui subjungitur Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum Recentiorum*, in which was included the first printed praise of "Paradise Lost." Although the work, like so many others of the time, is almost literally an enumeration, the minor poems get brief mention:

Joannes Miltonius, praeter alia quae scripsit elegantissima, tum Anglicè, tum Latinè, nuper publici juris fecit *Paradisum Amissum*, Poema, quod, sive sublimitatem argumenti, sive leporem simul et majestatem styli, sive sublimitatem inventionis, sive similitudines et descriptiones quam maximè naturales, respicamus, verè Heroicum, ni fallor, audiet: plurimum enim suffragiis qui non nesciunt judicare, censetur perfectionem hujus generis poematis assecutum esse.¹

Thomas Warton bars this testimony as coming from a relative. The superlative applied to the minor poems is typical.

1675. Phillips, Edward. *Theatrum Poetarum*, pp. 113-14:

John Milton, the Author (not to mention his other works, both in Latin and English, both in strict and solute Oration, by which his Fame is sufficiently known to all the Learned of Europe) of two Heroic Poems, and a Tragedy; namely *Paradise lost*, *Paradise Regain'd*, and *Samson Agonista*

¹ This passage is quoted from Godwin's *Lives* (1815) of Milton's two nephews, p. 145, note.

[sic]; in which how far he hath reviv'd the Majesty and true *Decorum* of Heroic Poesy and Tragedy: it will better become a person less related then myself, to deliver this judgement.

This affirmation of an international reputation for the early poems is valuable evidence against the theory of neglect.¹

Ca. 1681? Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives* (Oxford, 1898), II, 60-72. Aubrey's notes, concerned with biographical fact rather than criticism, mention the friendship with Diodati as reflected in the poems, and call attention to Milton's precocity by saying of the "Poems": "Some writt but at 18."

— Undated letters between Waller and St. Evremond afford invaluable evidence. Dr. Good dates the letters about 1673 "or later" (*op. cit.*, p. 141). Waller writes:

There is one *John Milton*, an old commonwealth's man, who hath in the latter part of his life, written a poem intituled *Paradise Lost*; and to say the truth, it is not without some fancy and bold invention. But I am much better pleased with some smaller productions of his in the scenical and pastoral way; one of which called *Lycidas* I shall forthwith send you, that you may have some amends for the trouble of reading this bad poetry. [He had enclosed verses of his own.]

And St. Evremond replies:

The poem called *Lycidas*, which you say is written by Mr. *Milton*, has given me much pleasure. It has in it what I conceive to be the true spirit of pastoral poetry, the old Arcadian enthusiasm. . . . What pleases me in *John Milton's* poem, besides the true pastoral enthusiasm and the scenical merit, is the various and easy flow of its numbers. Those measures are well adapted to the tender kind of imagery, though they are not expressive of the first strong impressions of grief.²

1687. Winstanley, William. *The lives of the most Famous English Poets*. Here we have one long sentence devoted to Milton in which Winstanley copies the misspelling of Milton's three major titles from the *Theatrum Poetarum*, without mentioning the minor poems at all. Phillips' sentence about Milton's fame as based on other works than these three roused all Winstanley's political antag-

¹ An ambiguity in Phillips' further praise of Milton's heroic poems on page 114 (under John Phillips) has amusingly misled the unintelligent Winstanley in his *Lives* (1687), p. 210—and also the *D.N.B.* (see John Phillips).

² These quotations are from *Letters supposed to have passed between M. de St. Evremond and Mr. Waller* (1809), pp. 133-38.

onism and he exclaims: "But his Fame is gone out like a Candle in a snuff, and his Memory will always stink, which might have ever lived in honourable Repute, had he not been a notorious Traytor."

1687. Ayres, Philip. *Lyric Poems*. In the Preface to this volume the writer defends "sonnets, canzons, madrigals, &c."—of which, either original or translated, his volume largely consists—saying:

For many eminent Persons have published several things of this nature, and in this method, both Translations and Poems of their own; As the famous Mr. *Spencer*, Sir *Philip Sidney*, Sir *Richard Fanshaw*, Mr. *Milton*, and some few others; The success of all which, in these things, I must needs say, cannot much be boasted of; and tho' I have little reason after it, to expect Credit from these my slight Miscellanies, yet has it not discouraged me from adventuring on what my Genius prompted me to.

This passage obviously is a complaint that lyric poetry (especially sonnets, he probably meant) in general is neglected. Milton as a lyricist is mentioned apparently with Ayres' favorites.

1688. Morhof, Daniel George. *Polyhistor sive notitia auctorum et rerum commentarii*. I have not seen this edition, but that of 1695 (the second), after a defense of Milton's Latin prose as compared with that of Saumaise, remarks:

Quicquid tamen ejus sit, ostendunt Miltoni scripta virum vel in ipsâ juventute: quae enim ille adolescens scripsit carmina Latina, unâ cum Anglicis edita, aetatem illam longè superant, quâ ille vir scripsit poemata Anglica sed sine rhythmis, quos ut pestes carminum vernaculorum abesse volebat, quale illud 12. libris constans *the paradise lost*. Plena ingenii & acuminis sunt, sed insuavia tamen videntur ob rhythmî defectum, quem ego abesse à tali carminum genere non posse existimo, quicquid etiam illi, & Italis nonnullis, & nuper Isaaco Vossio in libro poematum cantu, videatur.¹

The first part of this is amusing as a reply to Saumaise (*vide supra*), and the last part as a reaction to blank verse. There may be lack of judgment but there is no lack of praise with regard to the lesser poems. See 1660 and also 1732.

1691. Langbaine, Gerard. *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*. Milton is treated on pages 375-77. A page and a half are

¹ Liber I, cap. xxiv, pp. 304-5.

devoted to "Samson," mainly to its versification, and to "Comus." For "Comus" considerable title-page information is given. The other poems are merely listed; the "Poems in Latin and English" are dated 1645; Langbaine is ignorant of the date of "Paradise Lost." Thomas Warton (*op. cit.*, p. vi) has misrepresented these facts.

1691. Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses*. This work, again, neglects the poetical genius of Milton, but does not neglect the minor poems more than the greater poems. The various poetical volumes are dutifully listed, and in column 880 it is said: "By his indefatigable study he profited exceedingly, wrote then several Poems, paraphras'd some of *David's Psalms*, performed the collegiate and academical exercise to the admiration of all, and was esteemed to be a virtuous and sober person, yet not to be ignorant of his own parts." In column 883 after listing the "Poems, &c. on several occasions" as published in 1673-4, he adds: "Among these are mix'd some of his Poems before mention'd, made in his youthful years." In column 884: "To conclude, he was more admired abroad, and by Foreigners, than at home; and was much visited by them when he liv'd in *Petty France*, some of whom have out of pure devotion gone to *Breadstreet* to see the House and Chamber where he was born, &c." This last shows that Phillips' statement about a continental reputation was not mere family pride. Probably his Latin and Italian poems had by 1690 aided his reputation throughout Europe more than had "Paradise Lost." At least Anthony Wood did not regard Milton as a poet of one poem.

1692. *The Athenian Mercury*, 16 January, 1691-2 (Vol. V, No. 14), prints an interesting discussion, "Whether Milton and Waller were not the best English Poets? and which the better of the two?" The poets are said to be "both excellent in their kind"; but Milton's merits are given the more attention. "Paradise Lost" and "Samson" receive most space, but the critic concludes his specification of merits by saying, "In his Juvenile Poems, those on Mirth and Melancholly, an Elegy on his Friend that was drown'd, and especially a Fragment of the Passion, are incomparable."

"Incomparable" is a word worth emphasizing. It is hard to see that the critic here is any less enthusiastic over the minor poems

than over "Paradise Lost" or "Samson," which naturally receive more space.¹

1692. [Gildon, Charles]. *Miscellany Poems upon Several Occasions*. Pages 29-33 print "Julii Mazarini, Cardinalis, Epitaphium: Authore Joh. Milton." This inclusion illustrates the interest of the time in anything signed John Milton.

1694. Phillips, Edward. *Life of Milton*. Prefixed to *Letters of State, Written by Mr. John Milton*. In this *Life* Phillips attends to biographical fact and neglects literary criticism. The "Nativity Ode," "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," and "Comus" are unmentioned. "The Vacation Exercise" and "Lycidas" as growing out of Milton's college experience are mentioned. Of the latter it is said: "Never was the loss of Friend so Elegantly lamented; and among the rest of his Juvenile Poems, some he wrote at the Age of 15, which contain a Poetical Genius scarce to be parallel'd by any English Writer" (p. ix).

1694. Hog, William. In the *Term Catalogues* (ed. Arber, II, 525) the following is listed for November, 1694: "Two poems (the one whereof was pen'd by Clievland; and the other by Milton) upon the death of a worthy and learned young gentleman, Mr. Ed. King, who was drown'd in the Irish Seas. To which is added, a Latin Paraphrase on both; which was pen'd by W. H. Quarto." See under 1690 and 1698.

1696. Gildon, Charles, editor. *Chorus Poetarum; or poems on Several Occasions*, etc. (For this date see the *Term Catalogues* [ed. Arber], II, 590. The title-page has the combination MDCLXIXIV.) Here Gildon prints (p. 19) "To Christina Queen of Sweden by Mr. Marvel." These lines have also been ascribed to Milton. Todd, in his edition of Milton (1809, I, 209), says of these verses to Christina: "They are ascribed to Fleetwood Shephard in a worthless book, entitled *Chorus Poetarum*, 8vo. 1684."

1697. Bayle, Pierre. *Dictionaire historique et critique*, II, 590. Here in a footnote Bayle treats of Milton's poetry. He devotes more space to the minor poems than to "Paradise Lost," but merely summarizes the remarks of Saumaise and gives dates for the Latin poems and the 1645 volume. See 1702.

¹ See Dr. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 142. I owe this reference and some others to the kindness of Professor R. S. Crane of Northwestern University. Sir Thomas Pope Blount, *De Re Poetica*, pp. 137-38, soon reprinted the entire passage without comment.

1698. Hog, William. *Comoedia Joannis Miltoni, viri clarissimi, (quae agebatur in Arce Ludensi,) paraphrasticè reddita, à Gulielmo Hogaeo.* So listed by Todd, *Milton's Works* (1809), I, 202. I have not seen the book. The preface should contain material valuable for this study.

1698. Toland, John. *A Complete Collection of the Historical, Political, and Miscellaneous Works of John Milton . . . In Three Volumes. To which is Prefix'd The Life of the Author.* The *Life* which Toland here printed is filled with the highest enthusiasm for all Milton's works. This Warton explains away as due to the influence of Edward Phillips. The praise, however, has a glow of sincerity that casts doubt upon Warton's notion. Only a few passages can be quoted. From page 7:

He wrote another Latin Elegy to CHARLES DEODATI; and in his twentieth year he made one on the approach of the Spring: but the following year he describes his falling in love with a Lady (whom he accidentally met, and never afterwards saw) in such tender Expressions, with those lively Passions and Images so natural, that you would think Love himself had directed his pen, or inspir'd your own Breast when you peruse them.

From page 10:

Our Author in mournful Notes bitterly laments the immature fate of this young Gentleman, whom he denotes by the appellation of *Damon* in an Eclog nothing inferior to the *Maronian Daphnis*, and which is to be still seen among his Latin Miscellanies.

From page 16:

Thus far our Author, who afterwards made this Character good in his inimitable Poem of *Paradise Lost*; and before this time in his *Comus* or Mask presented at Ludlow Castle, like which Piece in the peculiar disposition of the Story, the sweetness of the Numbers, the justness of the Expression, and the Moral it teaches, there is nothing extant in any Language.

Later, page 44, Toland says:

Our Author's Juvenil and Occasional Poems, both in *English* and *Latin*, were printed in one small volume. I took notice of the best of 'em in many places of this Discourse; but the Monody wherein he bewails his Learned Friend Mr. King drown'd in the *Irish* seas, is one of the finest he ever wrote.

On pages 20, 24, and 35 of his *Life*, Toland quotes sonnets by Milton, four of which he notes as "never printed with his other poems."

Aside from these sonnets no poems are in any way treated as if Toland thought himself their "discoverer" or as if he thought himself dealing with poems that had ever suffered neglect. It is astonishing that anyone who has read his *Life* attentively should think the poems were disregarded in Toland's day.

1699. Gildon, Charles. *Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets*. This reworking of Langbaine (1691) dwells naturally upon Milton's two dramatic pieces. Gildon mentions the indebtedness of Dryden's "Aureng-zebe" to "Samson" and cites sources for "Samson" itself. He gives brief facts regarding the presentation and printing of "Comus."

1702. Bayle, Pierre. *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. In this edition of his work Bayle adds material on Milton (see pp. 2112-18) from Toland's *Life*. This material deals with the poet's college experience and his Latin and Italian poems, which are mentioned with vague commendation. The surprising thing is that in the shuffle of revision Bayle drops all mention of Milton's major works—an omission notable in later editions of the *Dictionnaire*.¹

1705. *A Complete History of Europe, from the Year 1600 to the Treaty of Nimeguen*. Godwin (*op. cit.*, pp. 296-97) quotes this work, from the year 1674:

There is hardly anything that can make this year more remarkable than the death of the famous John Milton. . . . He has left us an imitable poem in blank verse, called *Paradice Lost*; as also *Paradice Regain'd*, *Sampson Agonistes*, and *Occasional Poems*.

Although here the interest, being historical, is all in Milton's opinions, the mention is quotable as characteristic, and also because Edward Phillips, whom Warton thought ever ready to praise his slighted uncle, does not mention Milton's death in his continuation of Baker's chronicle—at least there is no mention in the 1730 edition.

1705. Sir William Trumbull, a retired Secretary of State, on October 19 returned to his young friend Alexander Pope a borrowed copy of the minor poems, writing as follows:

I expected to find, what I have met with, an admirable genius in those poems, not only because they were Milton's, or were approved by Sir Henry

¹ On Birch's (1738) revision of Bayle's unsatisfactory account of Milton see Dr. Good, *op. cit.*, p. 125, notes.

Wotton, but because you had commended them; and give me leave to tell you, that I know nobody so like to equal him, even at the age he wrote most of them, as yourself. [From the Elwin-Courthope ed. of Pope's *Works*, VI, 2.]

This is important as discrediting the ungenerous story by Thomas Warton to the effect that Pope "pilfered from COMUS and the PENSEROSO" epithets and phrases for "Eloisa to Abelard," "conscious, that he might borrow from a book then scarcely remembered, without the hazard of a discovery, or the imputation of plagiarism" (*op. cit.*, pp. x, xi). Warton's further story that his father was instrumental in bringing these poems to Pope's attention about 1717 is discredited by Trumbull's letter as well as by Pope's early poems, which are saturated with the youthful work of Milton. "Then scarcely remembered" is an absurd phrase to apply to anything written by Milton, with "then" referring to 1717.¹

1709. *Tatler* No. 98 (Steele), November 24, uses "Comus" as an example of the effectiveness of moral poetry.

1711-12. *The Spectator*. In No. 249 (December 15, 1711) Addison quotes with praise the passage on Laughter from "L'Allegro" (lines 11-32). In No. 425 (July 8, 1712), lines 61-72 and 147-154 of "Il Penseroso" are quoted, ostensibly from memory. One or two slight misquotations make this seem actually what is being done. "Comus the God of Revels" is mentioned in this paper. One would certainly expect more quotations from these poems in the *Spectator*, but on the other hand, outside the papers on "Paradise Lost" not a great deal of standard English poetry is quoted; attention is rather given to new poems.

1715. Hughes, John. *An Essay on Allegorical Poetry*, etc. (See W. H. Durham, *Critical Essays* [1700-1725], pp. 86-104, especially p. 93.) Here we find quoted with admiration lines 109-20 of "Il Penseroso." In the same essay, speaking of the story of Circe, Hughes remarks: "There is another Copy of the *Circe*, in a Mask, by our famous *Milton*; the whole Plan of which is Allegorical, and it is written with a very Poetical Spirit on the same Moral, tho with different Characters" (*ibid.*, p. 94).

¹ On Pope's indebtedness to Milton see the excellent article by Mary Stuart Leather in *Eng. Stud.*, XXV, 400.

1716. *Dryden's Miscellany*. "The First part of Miscellany Poems. Containing Variety of New Translations of the ancient poets: Together with Several original poems. By the Most Eminent Hands. Publish'd by Mr. Dryden . . . The Fourth Edition." Here, at the reputed suggestion of Fenton, were included "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," and "Lycidas." They were reprinted in the fifth edition of this volume (1727).

1718. Gildon, Charles. *The Complete Art of Poetry*. This work, as Warton has said, strangely neglects Milton. Gildon seems to have been more interested in "Samson" than in Milton's other poems,¹ though he apparently realized the value already attached to anything by Milton.²

1719-21. Dennis, John. *Original Letters*, 1721. Under date of 1719 Dennis (see pp. 79-80), after quoting the epigram of Selvaggi and the verses of "Salsiki" (*sic!*), and mentioning the intimacy with Manso, says: "Thus, you see, the *Italians*, by his juvenile Essays, discover'd the great and growing Genius of *Milton*, whereas his Countrymen knew very little of him, even thirty Years after he had publish'd among them the noblest Poem in the World." Dennis' mistaken idea that "Paradise Lost" was recognized with shameful tardiness was very likely the father of the Warton notion about the minor poems. Few critics now would subscribe to Dennis' view.

1721. Dennis, John. *Original Letters*. In an undated letter, written "about sixteen years ago" and now printed, Dennis makes ironical retort to Collier's "Letter: Containing a Defense of a Regulated Stage." He says:

To King James succeeded King Charles the First; and then arose another famous Reformer, *John Milton* by Name, who not only left a Tragedy behind him, the Story of which he impiously borrow'd from the Bible, written, to leave him without Excuse, in his mature, nay declining Years, but has left a fine Encomium on Shakespear; has shewn an extraordinary Esteem for *Johnson*; and among all the Things that he thought fit to reform, so far had Prejudice laid hold of his Understanding, it never so much as came into his Head that the Stage was one of them [pp. 225-29].

¹ See *The Complete Art of Poetry*, p. 302; *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*, Volume the Seventh (published with Rowe's ed., 1710), p. lvii; *The Post-Man Robb'd of his Mail* (1719), p. 243; and see Gildon's reworking of Langbaine, here cited under 1699.

² See under the years 1692 and 1696.

On pages 78-79, as Thomas Warton points out, Dennis quotes from the Latin poems as used in Toland's *Life*.

1723. Burchet, J. "To Allan Ramsay on his *Richy and Sandy*." Printed in the *Poems* of Allan Ramsay (1723), p. 170. Though ambiguous the following lines seem a tribute to Milton's pastoral poems:

Nor dost thou, *Ramsay*, sightless Milton wrong
By ought contain'd in thy melodious Song;
For none but *Addy* could his Thoughts sublime
So well unriddle or his mystick Rhime.
And when he deign'd to let his Fancy rove
Where Sun-burnt Shepherds to the Nymphs make Love,
No one e'er told in softer Notes the Tales
Of rural Pleasures in the spangled Vales.¹

1724. Jacob, Giles. *The Poetical Register; or, the Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*. Pages 183-84 condense the material on Milton furnished by Langbaine's *Lives*, but add Dryden's epigram. In his *Historical Account of the Lives and Writings of the English Poets*, reprinted in this same year, Jacob devotes pages 100-106 to Milton. The literary criticism is taken almost verbatim from Toland's remarks on the precocity of Milton's college poems (which in turn had echoed Morhof), and also from the *Athenian Mercury* passage of 1692 which had pronounced the minor poems "incomparable." (These two volumes by Jacob were printed earlier than 1724 [1719, 1720], but I have not seen the first editions.)

1725. Fenton, Elijah. *Life of Milton* prefixed to the 1725 edition of the *Works*. (I quote from an 1829 reprint.) Fenton praises the minor poems very highly. He finds "the Mask of Comus, L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, and Lycidas, all in such an exquisite strain, that, though he had left no other monuments of his genius behind him, his name had been immortal."

1727. Theobald, Lewis, editor. *The Works of Shakespeare*. In the Preface to Volume I, while commenting on the opening of "Twelfth Night," Theobald remarks: "The general beauties of those two poems of MILTON, intitled, *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, are obvious to all readers, because the descriptions are the most

¹ Is this the passage referred to by Dr. Good, p. 141, n. 8? I have not seen the 1731 ed. of Ramsay.

poetical in the world."¹ He proceeds to show that these two poems with much art use the same images but excite opposite emotions by the different moods in which the images are presented.

1730. Mareuil. *Le Paradis reconquis, traduit de l'Anglois de Milton; avec quelques autres Pieces de Poësies*. "The four Pieces," remarks Birch (*Life of Milton*, pp. lv-lvi), "which the Translator has added, are *Lycidas*, *Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, and the *Ode on Christ's Nativity*."

Translation in quantity is very much more likely to result from a general fame of the works than from a personal partiality for them.

1730. Fenton, Elijah. *Observations on some of Mr. Waller's Poems*. On page c, in commenting on Waller's lines "To Mr. Henry Lawes," Fenton quotes Milton's sonnet to Lawes.

1731. Rowe, Elizabeth Singer. *Letters moral and entertaining*, Part II. That the minor poems were even by 1731 dear to the soft sentimentalists may be seen by the following: "As I was sitting in a summerhouse, my usual retreat in an afternoon, reading Milton's *Elegy on Lycidas*, a downy slumber closed my eyes, and sunk my sorrows in the pleasing oblivion" (quoted from Mrs. Rowe's *Works* [1796], I, 240).

1732. Bentley, Richard, editor. *Paradise Lost*. In this notorious edition Bentley uses the minor poems only once for illustrative material. He cites on page 2 "Comus," lines 43-44. This is doubtless to be classified as "neglect" of the minor poems.

1732. Pearce, Zachary. *Review of the Text of Milton's Paradise Lost*. Thomas Warton (p. xi) says that in this book the minor poems "frequently furnish collateral evidences in favour of the established text; and in the refutation of Bentley's chimerical corrections."

1732. Morhof, Daniel George. *Polyhistor Literarius* (3d ed.). From Tomus I, Liber VII, cap. iii ("De Poëtis Recentioribus"), p. 1070: "Recensuimus praecipuos Poëtarum Latinorum. . . . Ab Anglis commendari *Joh. Miltonus*, ut in Anglicis, ita in Latinis poematibus, solet." Here, as in practically all the encyclopedic

¹ On this passage see Warburton's letter to Birch (1737) in Nichols' *Literary History*, II, 81.

mentions of Milton from the very start, we find admiration of his lesser poetry taken for granted.

1734. Richardson, J. *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost. By J. Richardson, Father and Son, With a LIFE of the Author, and a Discourse on the Poem. By J. R. Sen.* It is impossible to quote all the enthusiastic praise the minor poems receive in this volume. "For their Dignity and Excellence they are sufficient to have set him among the most Celebrated of the Poets, even of the Ancients themselves; his *Mask* and *Lycidas* are perhaps Superior to all in their Several Kinds" (p. xv). Richardson has heard "*Lycidas*" placed above Theocritus. As explanatory material, or notes, for "*Paradise Lost*," passages are cited from other works the following number of times: from "*Paradise Regain'd*," 7; "*Comus*," 4; "*Il Penseroso*," 2; Sonnets, 2; one each from "*L'Allegro*," "*Lycidas*," and "*Samson*." Ten citations are from the Latin poems and seven from the prose works. Shakespeare is cited eleven times; Spenser, ten; Chaucer, two; and Cowley and Crashaw, once each. I note no citations from other English poets.

1734. Jortin, John. *Remarks on Spenser's Poems.* Pages 171-86 of this slight volume are devoted to "*Paradise Lost*," "*Paradise Regain'd*," and "*Samson*." The book consists mainly of quotations, with a bit of comment. Except for quoting two lines of "*Lycidas*" (p. 185), Jortin neglects the poems that interest us.

1734. In this year Warburton and Theobald were in correspondence annotating passages of the minor poems. See John Nichols' *Illustrations*, II, 634, 648. Annotation usually follows rather than precedes popularity.

1735. Duncombe, William. *Poems by John Hughes, with some select essays.* In his prefatory account of Hughes' life Duncombe quotes "*Lycidas*," lines 70-86, with application to Hughes.

1737. Warburton, writing to Birch in this year, remarks (Nichols' *Illustrations*, II, 79) of Milton: "He is the author of three perfect pieces of Poetry. His '*Paradise Lost*,' '*Samson Agonistes*,' and '*Masque at Ludlow Castle*.'" And again he says (*ibid.*, p. 81): "The '*L'Allegro*' and '*Il Penseroso*' are certainly masterpieces in their kind."

1738. Hayward, Thomas. *The British Muse, or, A Collection of Thoughts Moral, Natural, and Sublime, of our English Poets*. The Preface (by William Oldys) says on page xx: "In his choice of authors, he (i.e., the collector) has not used the noted poets of later date, as *Milton, Cowley, Waller, Dryden, Otway, Lee, Prior, Congreve*, and such of their successors as adorn our own times; he has chosen rather to devote himself to neglected and expiring merit." Nevertheless Thomas Warton (p. vii) adds this work to the list of anthologies that unreasonably neglect the minor poems. One need only quote Godwin (*op. cit.*, p. 287), who finds this omission by Hayward "no way extraordinary. . . . Hayward was far from suspecting what Warton has discovered, that Milton, either his larger, or his smaller poems, was a hidden treasure, or that his excellencies were among such as 'time and oblivion were on the point of cancelling.'" Of the five anthologies cited by Warton as his major proof of the neglect of the poems under consideration, it must now be evident that only two—those by Bysshe and Gildon—could properly have been mentioned.

1738. Birch, Thomas. *A Life of Milton* by Birch was prefixed to his edition of the *Complete Prose Works* in this year. In this *Life* Birch pays much attention to the minor poems and gives them high praise. His point of view is scholarly as well as appreciative, for he gives many facts about the poems and even collates the manuscripts of some to improve the text. This is the sort of work that is done on poems already popular—not the sort that would increase the general popularity of the poems.

1740. Peck, Francis. *New Memoirs of the Life and Poetical Works of Mr. John Milton*. This curious work seems to be a printing of notes and "commonplace-book" remarks that Peck had been accumulating (see p. 84 for evidence of accumulative writing). Much space and praise are awarded the minor poems, which receive annotation in pages 132-70. The epics are dealt with in pages 171-211.

In completing this section of our evidence it may be well to observe that in Theobald, Warburton, Birch, and Peck we have a strongly developed tendency to treat the poems not primarily as

subjects of eulogy—though these commentators all praise highly—but as matter for historical study. Earlier we have seen the poems meet most astonishing recognition in 1657 from Poole, and we have seen them as objects of enthusiasm in the criticism of Edward Phillips, the *Athenian Mercury*, Toland, and Fenton. Both these strains of appreciation are evidence of a popularity which in the late thirties of the eighteenth century resulted in the poems' being used with musical settings. In 1738 Dr. Arne wrote music for the Rev. John Dalton's version of "Comus"; in 1739 Charles Jennens made an arrangement of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso"—adding a third section, "Il Moderato"—which Handel set to music. This music, according to Joseph Warton, was what rescued the poems from obscurity! In 1742 Handel made an oratorio out of "Samson," and there were later less eminent attempts on "Paradise Lost" and "Lycidas." If the passages quoted in the preceding pages indicate anything, they seem to indicate that Joseph Warton was mistaken in thinking these musical settings a cause instead of a result of popularity.

It is true that there are a few volumes in which we should expect to find Milton's minor poems praised, or at least mentioned, but in which the authors are quite silent about them. These volumes, however, are rare—much rarer than Thomas Warton apparently thought them. And when criticized—except by Saumaise and Dryden—the minor poems are always commended, usually with superlative praise. The case might rest here; but since the litterateurs of this period were fully as imitative as they were critical, it may be worth while to note some of the many borrowings from the minor poems before 1740.

GEORGE SHERBURN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be concluded]

A SOURCE FOR THE STORM IN *THE TEMPEST*

It has long been one of the puzzles of Shakespearean criticism that no more definite source of *The Tempest* has been discovered. As a matter of fact three sources probably exist rather than one; there are at least three distinct ingredients in the play. One of these is the account of the storm. Another is the story of Prospero, which, though united to that of the storm, does not necessarily belong with it. A third element is the discussion of primitive man, and of man's relation to civilization and government.

Of the three points, the last is easiest to explain: Shakespeare had been reading Montaigne's essay "Of the Caniballes" and the comparison there given of civilized life with barbaric. It is likely that the idea of the island and its location come from this same essay. Jakob Ayrer's *Die Schöne Sidea* and Antonio de Eslava's *Primera Parte de las Noches de Invierno* furnish the best clues to the origin of the story of Prospero. It is with the first, the account of the storm, that I am here concerned.

Since the time of Malone it has been customary to assume that the account of the storm is based on the wreck of a vessel of Sir George Somers in the Bermudas in July, 1609. A report of this by Sylvester Jourdan was published in October of the next year, and is generally considered the direct source, though other narratives of the same event also appeared. That by William Strachey, often quoted and referred to, apparently did not appear until too late for Shakespeare's use. But none of the accounts contain any striking points of similarity to Shakespeare's storm, except such as are natural in any description of a shipwreck. It is doubtful if any one would have connected this wreck in the Bermudas with *The Tempest* had it not been for Ariel's reference to the "still-vex'd Bermoothes"; but this of course, far from supporting the belief that the Bermudas are the scene of the play, merely indicates the contrary; the point of the speech is that the Bermudas are at a considerable distance rather than near at hand.

This speech, however, was enough to suggest a reference to voyages to the Bermudas; as Furness points out, editors before Malone were familiar with these narratives, including Theobald, Warburton, Johnson, Farmer, and Steevens. "But none of these editors and critics had detected in the accounts of this shipwreck any clues leading to *The Tempest* or expressed any suspicion that this disastrous storm gave rise to the play." A careful comparison fails to show, it seems to me, any striking resemblances, and I am inclined to agree with Hunter, as quoted by Furness: "Mr. Malone has given the argument all the advantage it could derive from the artful aid of capitals and italics, but he seems to me to fail to show coincidence in anything, except what has been common to all storms and all disastrous shipwrecks from the beginning of the world." A connection has, however, come to be taken for granted, partly because no more plausible source has been suggested, and partly on account of various interesting inferences and theories derived from the belief that the scene of the play was the Bermudas.

A closer parallel is desirable before it can be said definitely that the source is known. That there is a source to be found seems reasonably certain from Shakespeare's method of work in his other plays; and the detachment of the whole incident from the rest of the comedy suggests that this source deals only with the storm, not with the other incidents of the drama. I believe the source is to be found in one of the *Colloquia* of Erasmus, called "Naufragium." Below I give a large part of this colloquy in an English translation by William Burton which appeared in 1606 as part of his book of translations from the *Colloquia* entitled *Seven Dialogues both Pithie and profitable*. "Naufragium" is the second of these, disguised on the title-page as: "2. Sheweth what comfort Poperie affordeth in time of daunger." Burton was a strong Protestant, and was doing his best in choosing his titles to capitalize the excitement against the Catholics which had been aroused by the recent Gunpowder Plot. I think that it will appear to any reader who will examine both this dialogue and the accounts of the storm in the Bermudas that the former is much closer to Shakespeare's account in substance, in form, and in tone. The matter of the colloquy and of the play is very similar; the form is that of

dialogue; and both, though narratives of events that are in themselves apparently tragic, treat these events in the vein of comedy. Burton in his translation rightly describes the colloquy as "A pittifull, yet pleasant Dialogue of a *Shipwracke*," and this would describe Shakespeare's wreck exactly.

It is very striking that both the storms are largely timeless and placeless. There is no indication in the first scene of *The Tempest*, aside from the Italian names, who the characters are, whither they are bound, where they come from, or where the storm occurs. This may be compared with the similar lack of definiteness as to time and place in *King Lear*; and it might be conjectured that the reason is the same in both cases—the source used was itself indefinite as to these matters. This exactly fits the "Naufragium"; here, as in the play, we merely find ourselves at the beginning on board a storm-tossed vessel, and see the sailors at work, the passengers in a panic, and the master going about among them. The action in the two cases starts at the same time, when the storm is at its height; we are dramatically introduced *in medias res*, without any preliminary explanations. As a Latin note in some of the editions of "Naufragium" remarks, the colloquy "starts abruptly, like a comedy."

It is a singular fact that in Shakespeare St. Elmo's fire appears, in spite of the fact that it is early afternoon and apparently light enough for Prospero and Miranda to see the struggles of the vessel from the shore. The explanation of this discrepancy, which I do not remember to have seen commented on, is to be found in Erasmus' narrative. He tells briefly of the night and the appearance of the ball of fire, and then skips suddenly to midday. Shakespeare, accordingly, introduces the picturesque description of the fire without noticing that he has put it at the wrong time of day. The appearance of this fire is the most striking feature of Ariel's report of the storm to Prospero, and it is to be especially noted that in none of the other accounts from which Shakespeare is sometimes said to have drawn is the fire described as descending from the mast and running about the lower parts of the ship.

In Erasmus the first of the characters to stand out clearly is a bad-tempered and contentious Italian, described as an ambassador

to the King of Scotland, who quarrels with the sailors and almost gets himself thrown into the sea by them. It is not hard to see in him the suggestion for Gonzalo in *The Tempest* and his very similar quarrels and protests.

There are many other points of similarity; a few may be suggested here. One of the speakers in Erasmus is named Antonius, a name which is perhaps the origin of Shakespeare's Antonio. In both narratives interested and sympathetic observers watch the wreck from the shore. In both the master and sailors give up hope and bid the passengers turn to prayers. The frenzy of the passengers and the description of their senseless conduct is similar, as is the account of their leaving the ship; Adam's escape in "Naufragium" is especially to be compared with that of the Prince in *The Tempest*. The general seamanship of the two accounts is much the same. The resolution to repent as a result of undergoing such perils, suggested to Adolphus by Antonius, is like the similar resolution of Alonso in *The Tempest*.

In addition to these and other likenesses in the incidents, there is a further important matter in connection with the style. The second scene of *The Tempest* is a long narrative of Prospero to Miranda, disguised as dialogue by having the listener frequently interpose short questions and comments. The form of this scene usually strikes the reader as a little odd and not especially dramatic, but it is exactly the method of Erasmus in the "Naufragium" and in the rest of the *Colloquia*. Many of the short speeches of the listener, Antonius, are strikingly like those of Miranda.

As copies of Burton's book are somewhat hard to obtain, at least in this country,¹ I give below extracts from his translation. The length of the whole dialogue is about twice that of the passages here given. It is worth noting that most of the parts omitted are those dealing with religious matters and the senseless prayers and attempted bargainings of the passengers with various saints. These Shakespeare naturally did not find suited to his purpose, though their general tone is indicated by Gonzalo's remark: "The wills about be done! but I would fain die a dry death."

¹ I have not succeeded in finding any copy in this country. The passages here given are from a transcript of the whole dialogue taken from the copy in the British Museum. I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. A. Symons in having this transcript made for me.

Antonius. You tell me horrible things *Adolphus*, of your sea voyage, is this to be a Mariner: God keepe me from going to sea.

Adol. Yea, that I haue told you hitherto, is meere sport to those things you shal now heare.

Anto. I haue heard of euills more then enow, I trembled all the time you were reciting them, as if my selfe had beene in danger with you.

Adol. But to me my labours past were pleasing enough. But that night there happened a certaine thing, which for a great part of the night, tooke away all hope of life from the Maister of the ship.

Anto. What I pray you?

Adol. The night was somewhat light, and in the top of the maste stode one of the mariners in the basket (for so I thinke they cal it) looking about to see if he could spie any land: fast by this man beganne to stand a certaine round thing like a bal of fire, which (when it appeareth alone) is to the shipmen a most feareful signe of hard successe, but when two of them doe appeare together, that is a signe of a prosperous voyage. These apparitions were called in old time *Castor* and *Pollux*. . . . By and by the fiery globe sliding downe by the ropes, tumbled it selfe until it came to the Maister of the ship.

Anto. Did he not die with feare?

Adol. No, Mariners are accustomed to monsters. It hauing stayed there a while, it roled it selfe along the brimmes of the ship, and falling from thence downe into the middle roomes, it vanished away. About mid-night the tempest beganne to increase more and more: did you euer see the Alpes?

Anto. Yes, I haue scene them.

Adol. Those mountaines are but hillockes in comparison of the waues of the sea: so often as we were heaued up with them, we might haue touched the Moone with our fingers; so often as wee went downe againe, it seemed unto us as though the earth had opened, and we had beene going directly to hell.

Anto. O madmen that commit themselues to the sea!

Adol. The mariners striuing with the tempest, but all in vaine, at length the Maister of the ship came vnto vs very pale.

Anto. That palenesse doth presage some great euil.

Adol. My friends (quoth he) I can be no longer Maister of my ship, the windes haue gotten the vpper hand, it remaineth now, that we commit our selues vnto God, and euery man to prepare himselfe for extreamity.

Anto. O right Scythian sermon!

Adol. But first (quoth hee) the ship must be disburdened, necessity hath no law, a sore weapon it is, there is no remeady, better it is to saue our liues, with the losse of our goods, than to lose both goods and life together. The truth preuailed, many vessels were throwne ouer into the sea, ful of rich marchandise.

Anto. This was indeede to suffer wracke.

Adol. There was a certaine Italian in the ship, who had gone Ambassador to the King of Scots, hee had a chest ful of plate, gold rings, cloth, and silke apparel.

Anto. He would not bestow them vpon the sea.

Adol. No, but desired either to perish with his beloued riches, or to be saued with them. Therefore he was somewhat wilful, and stooode against the rest.

Anto. What said the ship-maister?

Adol. We could be wel content (quoth hee) that thou, and that thou hast, should perish together: but it is not fit that all we should be in danger for the sauing of thy chest: if you wil not be ruled, we wil throw both you and your chest hed-long together into the sea.

Anto. A right mariners oration.

Adol. So the Italian lost his goods, wishing all euil both to the heauens and the hells, for that hee had committed his life to so barbarous an element.

Anto. I know that is the manner of Italians.

Adol. A little while after, when we saw that the windes raged more and more, and we had done what we could, they cut the ropes, and cast the sailes ouer-board.

Anto. O miserable calamity!

Adol. Then the Maister came to vs againe, friends (quoth he) the time doth exhorte euery man to commend himselfe to God, and to prepare himselfe for to die. He was asked of certaine, who were not altogether ignorant of seafaring, for how many houres he thought the ship might defend it selfe, he said that he could promise nothing, but aboue three houres hee said it was not possible.

Anto. This speech was yet harder then the rest.

Ad. When he had so said, he commanded al the ropes to be cut, and the maine-maste to be sawen downe close by the bore wherein it stood, and together with the saile-yardes to be cast ouer boord into the sea.

Anto. Why did he so?

Adol. Because (the saile being gone or torne) it serued to no use, but to burthen the ship: all their hope was in the sterne or rudder.

An. What did the passengers & shipmen in the mean time?

Adol. There you should haue seene a miserable face of things, the mariners singing *Salue regina*, they cried to the Virgine *Mary* for help. . . . Many falling flat vpon the boordes, did worship the sea, crying; O most gentle Sea, O most noble Sea, O most rich Sea, O most faire Sea, be quiet, saue vs: and thus they cried to the deafe sea.¹ . . . In the meane time, the ship rushed vpon a shallow, and the Maister fearing lest it would be split all in peeces, he bound it together with Cables, from the foredocke to the sterne.

Anto. O miserable shifts.

Adol. In the meane time there stands vp a certaine Masse Priest, an old man, about three score, he casting off all his cloathes to his verie shirt, together with his bootes and shooes, wished all the rest in like manner to prepare themselues to swimme. . . . While these things were thus in doing, the Master of the ship came againe vnto vs weeping, and said, let euerie man shift now for him selfe, for we are not like to haue anie vse of the ship a quarter of an houre, for it being torne in certaine places, the water came in apace. Within a little while after, the Master tolde vs that he had spied a holy Tower, or a Church. . . . In the meane time the Pilot as much as lay in him, did guide the ship that way, which was now torne and rent, and leaking on euery side, and had fallen all to peeces, if it had not bene bound together with Cables.

Anto. Things were now at a hard passe.

Adol. We were driuen so neare, that the inhabitants of that place might see vs, and in what daunger we were. They came running out by heapes vnto the shoare, and holding vp their cloakes, and their hats vpon poles did inuite vs to come vnto them. And casting vp their armes towards heauen, did thereby signifie how much they did bewaile our hard fortune. . . .

Ant. What became in the meane time of that same woman that was so quiet?

Adol. She was the first that came to the shoare: for we had put her vpon a broade table, and had made her so fast vnto it, that shee could not easily fall off, and we put a little boord into her hand, which she might vse in steade of an oare, and so bidding her farewell, wee thrust her off with a quant, that shee might be free from the shippe, where was all the daunger. . . . In such a strait, I had rather haue a peece of vile corke, than a golden candlesticke: while I was looking about for a thing to swimme vpon, at the last I remembered the lower end of the maste. . . . In the meane time wee drunke in a great deale of salt water: but the priest taught mee a remedie against it.

Ant. What was that I pray you?

Adol. So often as any waue came toward vs, hee woulde turne his noddle against it with his mouth close. . . . Doe you (quoth hee) what you thinke best to be done, I giue you all the maste, and I will betake my selfe wholly to the ground: and withall, when he sawe the billow go from him, he ran after it as fast as euer he could. And when the billowe came againe, he clasping both his hands together about both his knees, he stroue with all his might against the waues, hiding himselfe vnder them as Cormorants and Duckes vse to doe when they diue vnder the water. And when the billowe was past him againe, he set forward and ranne.¹ . . .

Ant. But I beleeeue you will not go to sea againe in haste.

¹ Cf. *Tempest*, II, 1, 114-22; II, 2, 132.

Adol. I doe not meane it, vnlesse God shall depriue me of my wittes.

Ant. And I had rather heare such tales, than make triall of them: but thankes be to God that hath preserued you, and I hope you will be the better for this to him-ward while you liue.

Adol. God graunt I may.

In the case of *The Tempest*, a determination of the source is important for the dating of the play. The later limit of time is probably 1611; if the accounts of Somers' shipwreck were used, then the earlier limit could hardly be before 1610. There is nothing in the metrical tests to suggest a date different from this; on the other hand, these tests are not altogether consistent, and would not preclude dating the play as early as the time of the composition of *Pericles*. The idea that *The Tempest* is a sort of farewell to the stage and that Prospero is Shakespeare himself has caused many critics to attempt to set the date as late as possible. But if the source of the storm is "Naufragium," the play may have been composed before 1610.

JOHN D. REA

EARLHAM COLLEGE

CHAUCER'S "OPIE OF THEBES FYN"

Chaucer's considerable knowledge of medical matters is well known. Witness his description of the Doctor of Physic in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*; the diagnosis of Arcite's condition after his fall from his horse in the *Knight's Tale* (A. 2743 f.); the specific mention of "signes of empoisoning" in the *Pardoner's Tale* (C. 889 f.); the "povre widwes" freedom from disease and the reason therefor in the *Nun's Priest's Tale* (B. 4026 f.); the fuller discourse of Pertelote on the probable cause of Chauntecleer's bad dreams; and the still more elaborate description of remedies (B. 4111-57). More recently we have learned from Professor Lowes¹ that, in attributing to Palamon the "loveres maladye Of Hereos" (A. 1373-74), Chaucer was wiser in mediaeval medicine than his commentators for many a day.

Let me call attention to two instances, not adequately explained, in which Chaucer has introduced specific references to mediaeval medicines where there were no such references in his originals. In the tale of Hypermnestra (*Legend of Good Women*, 2668-70) Chaucer makes "Egestes" tell his daughter of the draught he gives her for her husband:

Yif him to drinke whan he goth to reste,
And he shal slepe as longe as ever thee leste,
The nercotiks and opies been so stronge.

For this specific mention of narcotics and opium Ovid² has only the most general allusion to a soporific in

Quaeque tibi dederam vina, soporis erant.

In the second instance Chaucer's use of narcotics and opium is even more a departure from the original. Boccaccio in the *Teseide* has Palamon escape from prison by changing clothes with his

¹ *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 491.

² *Heroides* xlv. 42.

physician Alimeto. Chaucer makes the escape depend upon a wholly different circumstance (*Kt. T.*, 612-16):

For he had yive his gayler drinke so
Of a clarree maad of a certeyn wyn,
With nercotikes and opie of Thebes fyn,
That al that night, thogh that men wolde him shake,
The gayler sleep, he mighte nat awake.¹

Palamon himself had drugged the "gayler" with the finest opium in the world, "opie of Thebes," of which no adequate account has been given by Chaucer commentators.²

I have neither time nor mediaeval medical books sufficient to follow out minutely the sources of Chaucer's knowledge of Thebaic opium and narcotics, but some hints may be given. Thus the ancients knew two forms of opium, one a decoction of the whole poppy plant called meconium (Gk. *μηκώνειον*), as by Theophrastus (b. about 372 B.C.), the first botanist. The other was opium proper (Gk. *ὀπός, ὀπιον*) from the seed pod only, discussed by Dioscorides of Anazarba (ca. 77 A.D.), who wrote the most important work of the ancients on medicinal plants. Both these forms of opium continued to be known and used through the middle ages, and both are mentioned, for example, by Simon A Cordo (Januensis), who died some ten years before Chaucer was born. Chaucer's plural "opies" of the *Legend of Good Women* may therefore have been based on his knowledge of the two kinds of opium³ known in his time and long before. This at any rate seems probable, although it is possible he merely refers to opium as grown in different localities. Thus the commercial opium of the middle ages to the twelfth century is said to have come from Asia Minor.

¹ In the original (*Teseide*, V, st. 24) mention is made of wine which Panphilo had brought in, and he and the guard drink until they are *mezzo afatappiato*. Yet the wine is not said to be drugged, and plays a less essential part in Palamon's escape.

² Professor Skeat notes the occurrence of *Opium Thebaicum* in the margin of the Ellesmere and Harleian MSS. Beyond this he mentions merely that the term is found in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Others have ineffective notes.

³ The word meconium has almost a place in Old English. In the *Leechdoms*, I, 156, a remedy for sore eyes mentions the "popig . . . þe Grecas macorlas and Romane papaver album nemnaþ and Engle hwit popig hataþ." The word *macorlas*, though not hitherto explained, I believe, must be a modification of Greek *μηκώνειον*, or of Latin *meconium*, probably in the plural form. I conjecture also that the OE. word had *æ*, or *e* for *a*, corresponding to Greek *η*, to which we have something like a parallel in Orm's use in early Middle English. The final *s* is paralleled by that in *lactucas* for *lactuca*, 'lettuce,' in *Leechdoms*, II, 212, 12.

Thebaic opium requires a further note. Pliny in his *Natural History* refers the cultivation of opium to Asia Minor only. But a commentator on Pliny, Bk. XX, cap. 76 (*Excursus de Opio* in the edition of the *Bibl. Clas. Latina*) gives the significant statement:

Arabes et officinae Thebaicum, seu quod in Egypto circa Thebas colligitur, opium prae caeteris commendarunt.

One of the most important of these Arabian physicians, the learned botanist and traveler Ibn Baithar (d. 1248), had this to say of opium and its origin in Egypt. I quote from L. Leclerc's French version:

Il n'est réellement connu ni en Orient ni en Occident, mais seulement en Egypte et particulièrement dans le Saïd, au lieu appelé Boutidj [the name in Arabic follows]. C'est de là qu'il provient et qu'on l'expédie dans toutes les autres contrées.

Simon A Cordo of Genoa (Januensis), who traveled widely to acquire knowledge of medicinal plants in their native haunts, is very explicit regarding opium Thebaicum in his *Clavis Sanationis*. As will be seen he also distinguishes meconium:

Opium ab opos que est lacrimus nomen extrahit. Opium verum que est melius fit scissis leviter capitellis papaverum nigrorum adhuc verentium terre ita ne scissura interiora penetret iteri ora et lac que egreditur collectum in vasculis desiccatur tale tebaicum vacatur. Sed quando capita ipsa cui suis foliis contunduntur exprimiturque succus atque siccatur sit aliud opiumque miconis dicitur que patet per dia. ca. de miconio que est papaver.¹

Let me add a modern confirmation of Chaucer from *An Inquiry into the Nature and Properties of Opium* by Dr. Samuel Crumpe, London, 1793, p. 12:

Egypt, and especially the country about Thebes, was long famous for the quantity and excellence of its Opium, and hence the term Thebaic still given to some of its preparations.

The term Thebaic, by the way, is still preserved in Thebaine, one of the opium alkaloids discovered by Thiboumerly in 1835.

Of the narcotics Chaucer mentions both times in connection with opium, he gives us no hint. But by the fourteenth century

¹ From the Venice edition of 1486, which is without pagination. His fuller statement regarding meconium need not concern us here. The transcript was made for me at the Surgeon General's Library in Washington.

numerous narcotics were known, with no such distinction of any one as in the case of Thebaic opium. Thus Bernard Gordon, the Bernard of Chaucer's Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales* (l. 434), who wrote his *Practica seu Liliū Medicinæ* in 1307, under the caption *De stupifacientibus, somnum provocantibus, et de iis quæ vomitum provocat*, has lists for internal and for external application. The former are:

Mitiora Sq. violaceus, syrupus de papavera; succi: lactucae, semper-vini, solatri, portulacae, cicutae; conserva: violarum, nymphaeae.

For external use he mentions:

Oleum violacium, oleum mandragoris, unguentem populconis, decoctum corticis mandrago., semen hyoscyami, lac muliebre, semen papaveris, decoctum salicis, opium, anethum viride in oleo coctum.¹

These, then, or some of them, we may assume to have been in Chaucer's mind when he added to his originals the explicit references to narcotics.

To return to Palamon's escape. It is not necessary for me to account for Palamon's manner of obtaining the drugs he used so effectively, though modern realism would certainly have done so more fully than by incidental allusion to the "helping of a freend" (*Kt. T.*, A. 1468). I suggest, however, that if Chaucer knew as much about the "lovers maladye of hereos" as our modern scholars, he must have known that "necrotiks" and even "opie of Thebes fyn" were a proper remedy for love-melancholy. They should therefore have been on the dressing table of an aristocratic prisoner afflicted so grievously as Palamon—and surely I need not account for the dressing table in a prince's prison chamber. Some new fury of jealousy against the more fortunate Arcite was all that was necessary to suggest the new use of the drugs. Compared, too, with Boccaccio's labored introduction of a physician who would risk death by impersonating Palamon, this is only another evidence of Chaucer's cleverness. Of course the sympathetic "freend" may have persuaded the jailor that Palamon's case of "hereos" required the remedies.

Professor Skeat did not make full use of the reference to opium Thebaicum in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. It proves to be

¹ *Liliū Medicinæ*, ed. of 1550, p. 915.

aptly in point however. Skeat refers it to Part III, Sec. ii, Mem. vi, Subsec. ii, without note of the edition he used. After some search I find it in Shilleto's edition, Part III, Sec. ii, Mem. v, Subsec. i, the very place it should be to support my conjecture. The whole "Member" is on *Cure of Love-Melancholy*, the "Heroical or Love-Melancholy" of Part III, Sec. i, Mem. i, Subsec. i, corresponding to Chaucer's "hereos" as Professor Lowes showed. The subsection in which the reference to Thebaic opium appears just at the close is devoted to the *Cure of Love-Melancholy by Labour, Diet, Physick, Fasting, &c.* The particular passage may as well be left in the Latin of Burton, but to make its aptness doubly sure it also mentions various narcotics, as Hyoseyamus (henbane), cicuta (hemlock), lactuca (lettuce), protulaca (purslane), all mentioned by Bernard Gordon quoted above. For the cure of love-melancholy these were to be used in external application. Hence the "clarree" which Palamon mixed for the unsuspecting jailor.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Thomas Warton, A Biographical and Critical Study. By CLARISSA RINAKER. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. II, No. 1, February, 1916. Pp. 241.

Miss Rinaker's dissertation, *Thomas Warton, A Biographical and Critical Study*, is clearly the product of long and painstaking research, and as such deserves all the praise that industry must ever command. Important new and unpublished manuscript materials as well as a large mass of printed documents are for the first time brought to bear on the great critic's life and work, and the volume closes with a list of more than seven hundred books used by Warton in the preparation of the *History of English Poetry*.

The purpose of Miss Rinaker's study as announced by the author is to determine the intrinsic and historical importance of Thomas Warton. She professes to discuss "the relation of all his work—his poetry, his criticism, his history of English poetry, his various antiquarian works—to the literary movements of his day." By these words, as well as by the extremely inclusive title adopted for the volume, Miss Rinaker commits herself to the task of estimating the intellectual equipment of one of the greatest browsers in an age of great browsers and of determining the significance of one of the most significant writers in the whole range of English literary history. That this task, requiring, as it does, not only tremendous research but also unusual analytical power and constructive imagination, has not been accomplished successfully within the limits of an ordinary doctoral dissertation, is hardly to be wondered at.

In numerous instances the reasoning is illogical, the language self-contradictory, or the idiom un-English. For example, we read that although the task of reconciling modern romantic literature with classical standards was "impossible," the critics of the rationalistic school "did not hesitate to accomplish it" (p. 38); and that Warton had "more than the eighteenth-century antiquary's boundless curiosity" (p. 87). In spite of the fact that Warton is admitted to be "without much creative poetical genius" (p. 23), his work is declared to be "distinguished in every field." See also the conflicting statements as to Warton's influence on Scott (p. 119 and note; pp. 142 f.), the attitude of the eighteenth century toward Chaucer (p. 39, l. 9; p. 88, l. 8), and the character of the early eighteenth-century imitations of Spenser (p. 39, ll. 25 ff.; p. 41, l. 5). See further page 33, lines 29 and 32; page 52, line 18; and page 73, line 2.

As John Dennis observes (*Studies in Eng. Lit.* [1876], p. 194),¹ reliable biographical material on Thomas Warton is exceedingly scanty; but Miss Rinaker introduces into her account of Warton's life far more doubt than even the meager data at our disposal necessitate. Her excessive use of "probably," "perhaps," and periphrases of similar meaning betray the timidity of the unseasoned investigator who sees difficulties where none really exist, or who, determined to make out a case of some sort at any expense, violates the important principle of historical research that, in the absence of reliable evidence, agnosticism is infinitely preferable to guesswork. For instance, Miss Rinaker says that "especially during his first years at Oxford Warton probably did not devote himself exclusively to scholarly pursuits, but tasted the robust pleasures and petty trials of the lighter side of Oxford life" (p. 20).² It is difficult to see why Miss Rinaker was led to qualify her assertion by "probably," especially in the face of the poems which she accepts as evidence. Compare the picture of the student given in the lines quoted (p. 21) from the "Panegyric on Oxford Ale" with the remainder of the poem, which shows him reposing his "gladsome limbs" at a pot-house, where he passes the hours "while in repeated round Returns replenish'd the successive cup." That the "Ode to a Grizzle Wig" contains much autobiography few would deny, but the facts appear somewhat distorted when it is discovered that Miss Rinaker's words, "contributing his share to an afternoon's pleasure at Wolvercote," are derived from Warton's line, "whole afternoons at Wolvercote I quaff'd" (Mant, *Works*, II, 205). Such passages arouse the suspicion that Miss Rinaker feels called upon to whitewash the character of her author—a precaution hardly necessary from the standpoint of either eighteenth-century morals or general literary history. Later (p. 136) she remarks that "one is seldom justified in interpreting poetry autobiographically," and cautiously suggests that the obviously autobiographical sonnet "To the River Lodon" contains a "personal note."

Warton's relation to certain of his contemporaries appears to deserve more attention than Miss Rinaker bestows upon the matter.

In treating the important subject of the elder Thomas Warton's influence upon his more gifted son, the author might have made out a much stronger case had she assembled and properly weighed all the evidence. If we judge by her language, most of her conclusions are open to question; in two pages of observations on the relations between father and son "no doubt," "probably," "perhaps," and similar expressions occur at least a dozen times. The assumption that by 1748 (the year in which the elder Warton's poems appeared) the son, then twenty years of age, "had already come into [his] real poetical patrimony" is hardly justified by the facts,

¹ Dennis' criticism of Warton is apparently unknown to Miss Rinaker.

² Earlier (p. 13) she observes that "Warton's boyhood days seem not to have been entirely filled . . . with study."

and evidence could easily be adduced to show how profoundly the bent of the younger writer's mind was affected by the literary and antiquarian tastes of his father. Miss Rinaker refers (p. 12) to Thomas Warton as singularly attached to his brother Joseph, and she points out certain instances of contact between the two throughout life, but she pays insufficient attention to the valuable and easily accessible evidence of sympathetic relations between the brothers as bearing on the literary output of the younger. The obvious imitation of Joseph's "Enthusiast" (1740) in Thomas' "Pleasures of Melancholy" (1745) is but one of the clear indications of an early and close connection between the authors—indications which might have led Miss Rinaker to suspect that the publication of the *Observations on the Faerie Queene* and the *Essay on Pope* (Vol. I) only two years apart was not accidental and that the real explanation of Thomas' temporary abandonment of poetry is to be sought not so much in his sensitiveness and his inability "to weather the storms of unfavorable criticism" (Rinaker, p. 35) as in his desire to give expression to theories crystallized by the exchange of ideas with his brother (contrast Miss Rinaker's statement, p. 57, ll. 7 ff.). There is little reason to believe that Thomas Warton during his early career took his mission as a poet more seriously than other university men of his age who entertained the common-rooms of Oxford and Cambridge with their effusions.¹ Additional light might have been thrown on Warton's critical and poetical equipment had his connection with other writers of the mid-eighteenth century been more fully treated. For example, in his "Mons Catharinæ" (1760) Warton imitates Gray's "Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College" (1747), but Miss Rinaker does not mention the similarity between the Latin and the English poem; nor does she note Warton's blunder in attributing to Gray a translation of "The Awakening of Angantyr" (cf. Kittredge, Introduction to Phelps's *Selections from Gray* [Boston, 1894], p. xlix) or Gray's tribute to Warton in the advertisement to the 1768 edition of the former's poems. See further Mant, *op. cit.*, I, 28; II, 174, n.

In connection with the *Observations on the Faerie Queene* Miss Rinaker makes much of Warton's "special preparation" for the task before him and of his "extensive knowledge of the neglected periods of early English literature" (p. 44; cf. p. 61); but she gives no adequate account of this "special preparation" and this "extensive knowledge." One expects at least a selected bibliography illustrative of Warton's *Belesenheit* in 1754, such as that furnished in connection with the *History of English Poetry*, but none such is forthcoming. Some of the books given as sources of the *History* were known to Warton at the time he wrote the *Observations*—a noteworthy fact in the history of his literary growth. For instance, *Don Quixote*,

¹ The "Epistle from Thomas Hearne," which Miss Rinaker attributes to Joseph on the strength of the latter's reference to it as "my verses," was assigned to the proper author as early as 1810 in Chalmers' *Eng. Poets*, XVIII, 170, but Miss Rinaker does not refer to Chalmers in this connection.

which Miss Rinaker includes in her list of sources of the *History*, was used in writing the *Observations* and had been known to Warton as early as 1751 (cf. "Newmarket, A Satire").¹ Hickes's deservedly famous *Thesaurus*, one of the most widely read and respected scholarly works accessible to the pioneers of English romanticism, is represented in Miss Rinaker's list of sources of the *History* by Wotton's *Conspectus Brevis* (1708), but the original was used by Warton in his *Observations* and is there cited (ed. 1807, p. 89, note) along with the work of the seventeenth-century Swedish antiquary, Olaus Verelius. Among other works which are listed by Miss Rinaker as sources of the *History* and which were known to Warton in 1754, special attention should be called to Drayton's *Polyolbion*, a poem whose influence on Warton Miss Rinaker apparently makes little effort to estimate.

Although Miss Rinaker is safe enough in calling the *Observations* "the first important piece of modern historical criticism in the field of English literature" (p. 38), it is quite misleading to imply, as the author frequently does, that Warton was the first English critic to use the historical method—that he, to use Miss Rinaker's phraseology, "produced the historical method" (Preface). Even the hasty survey to be found in G. M. Miller's *Historical Point of View in English Criticism from 1570 to 1770* (*Angl. Forschn.*, Heft 35 [1913]), contains abundant evidence that Warton was by no means the first to apply the historical method to English literary criticism. Miller's conclusions, though detracting in nothing from Warton's importance as a critic, deprive him of the factitious merit of absolute originality claimed for him by Miss Rinaker, and, had they been known to her, would have prevented many unguarded statements. In fact, Miss Rinaker's whole tendency is to overemphasize the value of romantic at the expense of classical standards. Instead of adopting the impartial attitude of the best modern critics, she too obviously holds a brief for Warton's type of criticism as opposed to that of his predecessors.

It is surprising that Miss Rinaker regards it as "impossible to give an adequate idea of the variety of books" used by Warton in writing the *History of English Poetry* (p. 121), especially in view of the labor she has expended in identifying the editions consulted. The task is indeed difficult, but it is one which the critical biographer must not shirk. What is needed is an account of the use which Warton made of at least his chief authorities—the facts, theories, and documents which he regarded as worthy of elucidation or preservation, and his method of dealing with them.

Moreover, the principle by which Miss Rinaker is guided in the selection of books for her list is unfortunate, since it involves the omission of certain works which are important as sources of literary if not of historical information. The exclusion of Hickes's *Thesaurus* has already been referred to.

¹ Sixteen hundred and eight, given as the date of Jarvis' translation of *Don Quixote* (p. 188), is obviously a misprint. The earliest edition containing Warburton's essay was the second, in 1749. See further Rius, *Bibliografía crítica de las obras de . . . Cervantes* (Madrid, 1895), I, 262.

Oddly enough, Miss Rinaker appears to think that the *Thesaurus* is a glossary (p. 121).

A more careful examination of Warton's reading would have thrown much light on the sources from which the poet derived the "truth severe" which he later dressed "by fairy fiction." In spite of frequent emphasis on Warton's interest in the past as the keynote of his work, Miss Rinaker treats inadequately his attitude toward one of the most important sources of romantic and antiquarian enthusiasm in the eighteenth century—Northern Antiquities. Warton's references to Scandinavian literature and the services of the *History of English Poetry* in popularizing the traditions of the North are discussed by Farley, *Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement* (Boston, 1903), pp. 90 f. (See further p. 77, n. 1; p. 86; cf. Drake, *Essays*, II [1810], 219.) Miss Rinaker does not refer to Farley's book nor to Kittredge's note (Phelps's *Selections from Gray*, p. xlix). Attention may be drawn to the "Dying Ode of Ragnar Lodbrog," since Miss Rinaker mentions the poem without grasping its significance. The author notes that the elder Warton versified two scraps of the song from the Latin quoted by Sir William Temple, but she fails to observe that both sons speak with enthusiasm of the Latin version (*Essay on Pope* [5th ed., 1806], I, 357 f.; *Hist. of Eng. Poet.*, ed. Hazlitt, I, 117, nn.), and that the younger probably had it in mind when, in his ode "On His Majesty's Birthday" for 1788, he wrote the lines about "the sons of Saxon Elva . . . Who died, to drain the warrior-bowl" (Mant, *op. cit.*, II, 125 f.). The poem had a distinguished literary career during the eighteenth century. The passage on the druid in the "Pleasures of Melancholy" (1745) is pointed out by Miss Rinaker as an evidence of Warton's "interest in native mythology," but she says nothing of Warton's share in propagating the eighteenth-century druidic myth, nor is the imitation ballad of "Hardy-knute" (which had appeared as recently as 1724 in Ramsay's *Evergreen*, II, 247 ff.) mentioned in connection with the obvious reference to that poem in the "Ode on the Approach of Summer."

In spite of the tremendous importance of the Ossianic question in literary circles from 1760 on, Miss Rinaker says nothing of Warton's attitude toward the authenticity of Macpherson's work and the general subject of the Celtic past. She ignores even such obvious sources of information as the dissertation on the "Origin of Romantic Fiction in Europe." Warton's labors as an antiquarian can be seen in their true perspective only in connection with investigations in this field during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but Miss Rinaker gives no adequate account of such studies as a background for Warton's work. Valuable indications of Warton's interests found in certain of his minor prose works appear to have largely escaped Miss Rinaker. His *Life and Literary Remains of Ralph Bathurst* (1761) is referred to merely as "a labor of love" (p. 71); nothing

is said of the evidence it furnishes of Warton's acquaintance with Sprat's well-known *History of the Royal Society* and other seventeenth-century antiquarian and historical disquisitions. Attention might at least be called to Warton's enthusiasm over contemporary interest in the past (*Life of Bathurst*, p. 150), to his praise of Bathurst for vindicating "antiquarian learning" (*op. cit.*, pp. 53 f.), and to the note in which he transcribes from one of the Aubrey manuscripts the famous traditions about Spenser's fellowship at Pembroke, Milton's whipping, and Shakespeare's being a butcher's son (*op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.).

To the influence of the Latin and Greek classics on Warton's English work Miss Rinaker gives scant attention (p. 138), and she disregards his considerable body of Latin verse, although it contains a number of passages illustrative of his fondness for the past.¹

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels. With Appendices on Some Idioms in the Germanic Languages. By MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR. Hesperia, Supplementary Series No. 5. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. Pp. xvi+240.

The title chosen by Professor Callaway indicates a broader field than that actually covered; the present work is merely the first instalment of proposed studies in the syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels and is concerned only with the participle and the infinitive. The next instalment is to be devoted to the subjunctive mood. The present work is accordingly an extension into the Northumbrian dialect of Professor Callaway's syntactic researches upon the participle and the infinitive in West Saxon (*The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, 1889; *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, 1901; and *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, 1913) and is really supplementary to them. The principle object is to compare the syntax of these forms in Northumbrian with that of the same verbals in West Saxon, and both method of approach and classification and arrangement of material are similar to those of the earlier studies. Like the earlier studies, the present one is an extremely careful and detailed analysis: every form is recorded, the Latin correspondents are given whenever they are at all significant, forms unclassified by other investigators are assigned, every doubtful or unusual construction is annotated, and no difficulty is evaded. The consideration of each usage is followed by an explanation of the origin of the construction as native or foreign, not only in Northumbrian and Old English,

¹ Miss Rinaker's bibliography of Warton's works omits a new edition of *The Oxford Sausage* which appeared in 1777.

but also in the various Germanic languages. Not the least valuable part of the work is the independent evaluation of the evidence concerning the origins of various Germanic idioms presented in the numerous studies that have appeared since Professor Callaway's earlier publications, or that had escaped his attention in them. The list of works consulted includes some four hundred titles.

Professor Callaway's study incidentally throws into strong relief the incompetence of the *Lindisfarne* gloss as an English translation, particularly its close, frequently slavish, dependence upon and imitation of the Latin original. His method, however, usually discriminates native idioms from mere imitations of the original. If the glosser regularly renders a Latin turn of expression by a similar construction in Northumbrian, without any apparent effort at substitution, it may be inferred that the idiom employed is common to both languages. On the other hand, if he consistently tries to avoid a Latin idiom and to employ a different mode of expression, it is to be inferred that the substitute is a native idiom. These criteria and a comparison with corresponding usages in West Saxon and in the various Germanic dialects provide a basis for reasonably well-grounded conclusions.

This investigation shows that though the proportion of constructions closely based on the Latin—particularly certain uses of the infinitive with accusative subject—is considerably higher in *Lindisfarne* than in the West Saxon texts, yet in the main the dialect of *Lindisfarne* does not greatly differ from West Saxon in the use of the infinitive and the participle. This study also, practically without exception, confirms Professor Callaway in the views as to the origins of infinitive and participial constructions that he had arrived at in his studies in West Saxon. There are disclosed, however, a small number of constructions in *Lindisfarne* that are not found in West Saxon, though to call some of them "idioms," as is done in the Preface (p. iv), makes an impression as to normal and native usage to which one may take exception, and one which Professor Callaway destroys in his detailed consideration. In most cases these "idioms" are merely abject imitations of the Latin, sometimes even imitations of Latin expressions that the glosser had stupidly misunderstood. Of all five clear instances of the imperative infinitive (pp. 175-76), for example, one renders a Latin imperative infinitive, and the remaining four misrender Latin passive imperatives that have the same form as infinitives. Similarly, in every occurrence of the infinitive as object of a preposition (pp. 117-18), the *Lindisfarne* rendering merely follows the Latin slavishly, employing the uninflected infinitive to correspond to the Latin infinitive, and the inflected infinitive to correspond to the Latin gerundive.

Of the infinitive constructions not found in West Saxon, that most frequently occurring is what Professor Callaway terms the elliptical accusative with infinitive construction (pp. 180-95). It is made up of an accusative

substantive and a participle—usually present though not infrequently past; it renders a Latin accusative and gerundive without *esse*, or future participle without *esse*; and it depends usually upon verbs of commanding or declaring. To this mode of expression, which Professor Callaway rightly considers a “very close translation of the Latin original,” he finds interesting parallels as to both form and origin in some constructions of early Scandinavian dialects and in the High German gerund. A cross-reference suggests a comparison of this elliptical accusative and infinitive construction with the inflected infinitive and subject accusative. Such a comparison apparently shows that the glosser of Lindisfarne employed these two constructions indiscriminately in rendering the Latin gerundive and future participle. In translating a Latin accusative and future participle Lindisfarne has *cuoeða* (*ait*) and *foresæcga* (*pronuntiare*) followed by the inflected infinitive; and *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*praenuntiare*), and *soðsæcga* (*pronuntiare*) followed by the present participle. In translating a Latin accusative and gerundive Lindisfarne has *beada* (*praecipere*), *bebeada* (*praecipere*), *cuoeða* (*ait, dicere*), *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*praedicere, pronuntiare*), and *læra* (*docere, ammonere*) followed by the inflected infinitive; and *beada* (*commendare*), *cuoeða* (*ait, dicere*), *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*praenuntiare*), and *læra* (*docere*) followed by the present participle. Yet, though the inflected infinitive and the present participle are thus used apparently without distinction, there is indication of a preference. The inflected infinitive twice renders the Latin future participle and 32 times the gerundive; the present participle 8 times renders the Latin future participle and only 11 times the gerundive. Further (see pp. 123-24) the inflected predicative infinitive with “to be” denoting necessity or obligation, in 15 out of 21 occurrences renders the Latin gerundive, the remaining instances representing a variety of Latin constructions; and the inflected predicative infinitive with “to be” denoting futurity, though of not infrequent occurrence in the West Saxon Gospels, is not found in Lindisfarne (pp. 124-25)—the glosser usually employing the present participle.¹

It has been noted above that in Lindisfarne an inflected infinitive as object of a preposition occasionally renders the Latin gerundive as object of a preposition. It seems probable then that in the dialect of the glosser of Lindisfarne the idea of obligation or necessity as expressed in Latin by the gerundival periphrasis was expressed by the inflected infinitive with “to be,” but that, wooden translator as the glosser was, mere similarity in form induced him frequently to represent the Latin gerundive by the Old English present participle. To a mechanical word-by-word translator, too, the present participle was the nearest equivalent to the Latin future as well as

¹ For example, Matt. 11:3: “Tu es qui uenturus es?” is in the West Saxon Gospels, “Eart ðu ðe to cumenne eart?” and in Lindisfarne, “Arð ðu seðe to cymende was uel is?”

present participle, in the same way that the Old English present tense rendered both present and future tenses of Latin.¹

In his consideration of the absolute participle Professor Callaway finds two constructions that he did not find in West Saxon—the absolute nominative (10 examples) and the absolute accusative (21 examples). He regards the absolute nominative as not really an idiom but the result of a mixture of two constructions (p. 38), “the glossator wavering between a finite verb, which requires a nominative case, and an absolute participle, which requires an oblique case.” The absolute accusative he does consider a genuine Northumbrian idiom and regards it as one of several Northumbrian constructions in which accusative interchanges with dative, contrary to West Saxon usage (pp. 26–28). In most of the instances cited as accusative or nominative absolute, the substantive is unmistakable in case form, as it is either a pronoun, or a noun limited by a demonstrative or a definite article. A number of others, however, though Professor Callaway classifies them as absolute datives—probably regarding them as “crude”² or “weathered” forms—have no sign of case in either substantive or participle. Of the 30 past participles listed as absolute datives (pp. 7–10), at least 7 are thus indistinguishable from the nominative. The confusion in Lindisfarne of nominative, accusative, and dative in the absolute participial construction is paralleled by the confusion of these three case forms—particularly in the singular—in many other constructions, a confusion much wider than a mere interchange of accusative and dative. Professor Callaway quotes (p. 29) from Lindelöf’s *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Altnordhumbrischen* (Helsingfors, 1893) statements that in this Lindisfarne gloss the nominative and the accusative of feminine nouns had fallen together, and that there were traces of the coalescence of the dative with the nominative and accusative.³ Carpenter, *passim*, in *Die Deklination in der nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift* (Bonn, 1910), has shown in detail that confusion in nominative, accusative, and dative case forms, particularly in the singular, extended through nouns of all genders, adjectives, participles, and pronouns. If any inference as to idiom can be drawn from the case forms employed in the absolute participial construction in Lindisfarne, probably it is that the group of substantive plus participle was used without any distinct feeling for case, very much as it is in modern English.

The study as a whole is pleasingly free from the minor errors that usually obtrude themselves in a minute analysis. There are, of course, occasional

¹ In West Saxon the inflected infinitive with “to be” was the regular idiom for rendering both Latin periphrastic conjugations—with the future participle as well as with the gerundive (Callaway, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 200–203).

² Professor Callaway’s use of “crude” as synonymous with “weathered” is altogether alien from that of Logemann, who first employed it (*Rule of St. Benet*, E.E.T.S., Orig. Series 90; Introduction V, § 3, p. xxxix), and of other students of Northumbrian, such as Lea and Carpenter.

³ The page reference to Lindelöf’s study is wrongly given as 299; it is 51.

lapses. *Druncniga* does not properly constitute an exception to the statement (pp. 102-3) that the objective infinitive that is active in form is active in sense, even though it renders a Latin passive (see *N.E.D.*, *drunken*, verb 1 and 2). *Awritta* in *were geneded ðat awritta* (*cogeretur ut scriberet*) is not an infinitive (p. 169) but a preterite optative, as it is recorded in Cook's glossary. There is a slight inconsistency in recording the total number of present appositive participles as 168 in one paragraph and 167 in a paragraph immediately following (p. 61). The reference (p. 182) under *foresæga* to Mark, Introduction, 4, 14 is inexact. The compositor may well be responsible for a confusing "uninflected" which occurs twice for "inflected" in the description of the prepositional infinitive (p. 90). The work suffers very little, however, from typographical errors, the only others observed being "prseent" (p. 67), "serictly" (p. 137), and a semicolon for a comma on page 168. One may be sure that no work of Professor Callaway's will be marred by slovenliness.

W. F. BRYAN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The American Language. By H. L. MENCKEN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919. Pp. x+374.

This book is an attempt at a comprehensive account of the English language as spoken in America. Its earlier pages are largely devoted to two subjects on which the author apparently wishes to start a controversy: one, that American philologists despise the actual speech of their own country; the other, that the American speech is preferable to the English, its new words more effective ("more honest, more picturesque, more thoroughly Anglo-Saxon," etc.). He is able to maintain the first view chiefly by rather devious methods—emphasis on the expressed views of authorities whose interest was chiefly in rhetoric, and disparagement of the work of the Dialect Society and of the scholars who have investigated problems in American speech. He makes much of the fact that no comprehensive study of our language exists. The reason, of course, is that no philologist has felt himself equipped to handle so vast a subject, one which requires an exact knowledge of all the dialects spoken in this country and in England. In advancing the second opinion he quotes only notably vigorous or picturesque Americanisms and disregards effective Anglicisms (e.g., *slacker*, *Anzac*, *tank*). With these unfortunate preconceptions and his lack of philological training the author naturally has a distorted view of many things. He will not recognize dialects in this country (p. 19); apparently he always thinks of standard English as the only language of England but judges American speech by its colloquial forms; whenever sounds are involved he is likely to make extraordinary errors, e.g., "*G* disappears from the ends of words

[presumably *ing* becomes *in*] and sometimes, too, in the middle, as in *stren'th* and *reco'nize*"; and he has a vague conception of differences in function of words (on p. 217, for instance, he thinks that the American use of *them* as a demonstrative proves that the derivation of *'em* from *hem* is wrong; on p. 219 he treats *ye* in *look ye* as objective; on p. 222 he seems to say that *me* in "I lit *me* pipe" is from *me*). One could fill pages with examples of the errors resulting from the author's lack of systematic training. Even his statements as to vocabulary are not reliable; e.g., *pail*, *coal-hod*, and *postman* are widely used in this country.

Yet, despite the extraordinary faults that make it untrustworthy, the book contains a great deal of interesting correct information, and on many points its author has sound philological ideas. It is a convenient and useful work for the general reader and the undergraduate student interested in language.

JAMES ROOT HULBERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Tragedy of Tragedies, or the Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great, with the Annotations of H. Scriblerus Secundus. By HENRY FIELDING. Edited by JAMES T. HILLHOUSE. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1918. Pp. viii+223.

Professor Hillhouse's edition of *The Tragedy of Tragedies* furnishes in compact form a large amount of hitherto uncollected data bearing on Fielding's early dramatic work as well as on the interests of the English literary public during the second quarter of the eighteenth century. The editor has rendered the student of Fielding an especial service by reprinting with collations the first edition of the *Tom Thumb* of 1730 in juxtaposition with the enlarged version of the following year. In the introduction, appendixes, and notes he deals with the stage history of the play and with its burlesque of the heroic drama. A more exhaustive study of the circumstances under which the play was composed would probably show that Fielding's choice of chap-book accounts of Tom Thumb and Arthur as a vehicle for satire are more intimately connected with the contemporary reaction against the growing interest in antiquarian research and the "low" literature of the people than has generally been suspected. In connection with the editor's discussion of early eighteenth-century chap-book versions of the life of Tom Thumb, attention may be called to Ritson's reference (*Pieces of Anc. Pop. Poetry* [1791], p. 98) to a folio edition of *Thomas Redivivus* containing Wagstaffe's *Comment* and published the year before the first version of Fielding's play.

T. P. C.

The Case Is Altered. By BEN JONSON. Edited by WILLIAM EDWARD SELIN. Yale Studies in English, LVI. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917. Pp. lxvi+216.

Like the editions of other plays of Jonson in the Yale Studies, *The Case Is Altered* is well printed and is elaborately edited with introduction, text, notes, glossary, bibliography, and index. Students will welcome especially the reprint of the text from the best copies of the quarto, and the facsimile of the three forms of the title-page. The notes contain valuable quotations and references that help to illumine difficult passages or obscure allusions and to illustrate Jonson's use of Plautus and other sources, but they are marred by gratuitous explanations of simple expressions and allusions and by an encyclopedic massing of information, often elementary and commonplace, on every point that will lend itself to comment. In the introduction the problems of text, authorship, date, literary satire, and sources are discussed. There is no notable contribution to our knowledge of the history of the play, though a somewhat elaborate attempt is made to apply metrical tests in order to solve the problem of authorship.

C. R. B.

British Criticisms of American Writings, 1783-1815. A Contribution to the Study of Anglo-American Literary Relationships. By WILLIAM B. CAIRNS. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 1. Madison, 1918. Pp. 97.

After a very brief preliminary survey of literary conditions, 1783-1815, we are here given a statement of the individual attitudes toward America of some two dozen writers and likewise the attitudes of the principal British periodicals. We have twelve pages on "the prevailing British attitude toward the intellectual development of America," and then chapters on the notices of non-literary American writings, of Franklin and Tom Paine, and of the various types of *belles lettres*. Two obstacles stand in the way of perfection in such a study: the fact that we lack first-class bibliographies of American literature of the period and the fact that Professor Cairns has not always had access to complete files of the periodicals consulted. The result is a competent and serviceable but by no means definitive study.

G. S.

M
1:
se
t,
ly
le
ns
ns
re
d
n-
on
s-
of
al

n
y
n
7.
5,
ca
sh
de
ne
e,
of
of
ot
he